

E 449

.F9617

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



00005021662









A REVIEW

OF THE

“CORRESPONDENCE”

OF

MESSRS. FULLER & WAYLAND,

ON THE SUBJECT OF

American Slavery:

BY CYRUS PITT GROSVENOR.

~~~~~  
Πάντα δὲ δοκιμάζετε· τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε. 1 Thess. v: 21.  
~~~~~

TO WHICH IS ADDED

A DISCOURSE,

BY ROGER WILLIAMS,

PRINTED, LONDON, 1652, ON

“THE HIRELING MINISTRY.”

~~~~~  
UTICA, N. Y.

PUBLISHED AT THE CHRISTIAN CONTRIBUTOR OFFICE

—  
H. H. CURTISS, PRINTER, DEVEREUX BLOCK.

1847.

E 449  
F 9617



Gift of Wilhelmine G.  
Wright

12-18-34

## P R E F A C E .

---

IN the spring of 1845, the writer received the following note, which, in connection with the previous suggestion of several respected individuals, has been the occasion of his writing this review :

“ To Eld. C. P. GROSVENOR :

Dear Brother,—At a meeting of friends of the slave, held in the meeting house of the North Beriah Baptist Church, New York, on the 9th of May, 1845, of which the undersigned were duly appointed officers, the following Resolution was unanimously adopted :

Resolved, That Br. C. P. GROSVENOR be respectfully requested to publish a Review of the recent controversy between Drs. FULLER and WAYLAND.

Permit us, in the discharge of our duty, to ask your compliance with the wishes of the meeting, as expressed in the Resolution, and thus oblige those we represent.

We believe good may thus be accomplished, and heartily concur in the object of the Resolution. [Signed.] A. L. POST, Chairman.  
I. B. PRICE, Clerk.”\*

Compliance with this request has been attended with both labor and solicitude : the latter springing mainly from the fear of falling into some misapprehension of the meaning of the writers, and of failing so to present the truth as to do justice to the momentous question at issue, whether the millions “ in bonds ” shall be free, or they with their multiplied posterity shall sigh and weep and groan on without relief, and whether the pure robe of Christianity shall be washed of the foul stain spread over it by Slavery, or continue to bear and exhibit that stain, wherever she turns and moves among a world of deriding observers. Still, by the belief that the sentiments I utter are true, and the views I give of the “ Correspondence ” are correct, and that the motives under which I write are approved of my final Judge, the labor is alleviated, and the solicitude mitigated, and the fear changed to hope.

---

\* At a Convention of Baptists held in Utica Aug. 5, 1846, the following resolution was passed :

“ On motion of Br. Tillinghast, voted to recommend the publication by Br. C. P. GROSVENOR, of his able Review of Fuller and Wayland, and that the members of this Convention aid in its circulation.”

A part of the Review had been printed in the Christian Contributor.

We shall purposely avoid words of flattery, and if our style may sometimes seem abrupt, let the candid reader consider whether it is not because of its directness and truth, perhaps, rather than because of any purpose of ours to treat any man rudely. If we must be thought *severe* in any thing, we hope that severity will not be found to consist in severe words. If the truth should seem severe, for that we are not responsible. Our prayer is that this Review may accomplish some good, and no evil to either of the writers or to either the free or the bond who may peruse, or be affected by it.

Utica, June, 1847.

THE AUTHOR.

NOTE.—At the Anniversary of the A. B. F. M. Society, held in Albany, May 5th and 6th, 1847, the publication of this Review was requested, and its circulation by the members recommended, by an unanimous vote.



## A R E V I E W

OF "DOMESTIC SLAVERY, *considered as a Scriptural Institution : in a Correspondence between the Rev. RICHARD FULLER, of Beaufort, S. C., and the Rev. FRANCIS WAYLAND, of Providence, R. I. Revised and corrected by the authors. New York: Published by Lewis Colby, 122 Nassau Street. Boston: Gould, Kendall & Lincoln. 1845.*"

The *title* of the book is objectionable, if Mr. Wayland is to be regarded as repudiating the idea that the sacred scriptures furnish *no* support for slavery—"Domestic Slavery considered as a Scriptural Institution"—since this title implies that both the writers "consider slavery scriptural." But I have supposed the idea intended by Mr. W. to be that the correspondents "considered"—argued the question—in the light of scripture truth; though, if I understand him, he has made admissions which go to a virtual surrender of the argument into his opponent's hands, and allow slavery to be "a scriptural institution." In this I am not alone. Mr. Fuller says, "if slavery was sanctioned in the Old and permitted in the New Testament, it cannot be a sin; and he who says it is, will answer to *God whom he affronts*, and not to me." It is our purpose to examine this proud position with care. I shall first consider

### MR. FULLER'S VIEWS OF SLAVERY AND HIS ARGUMENT.

In examining Mr. Fuller's view of slavery, I shall take his own statement of the proposition which was to be discussed by him and Mr. Wayland, and his own definition of slavery. This, I think, is the only fair way of treating his part of the "Correspondence."

"The question before us," says Mr. F., "I suppose to be simply this, *Is slaveholding always a sin?*"\* It is due to him

---

\* 1st Letter to Mr. W., p. 130.

to say, that, in discussing this proposition, Mr. F. is not, like certain northern opponents of abolition, guilty of descending to such mere quibbles as—"Is that slaveholder chargeable with sin, who would emancipate his slaves if he could, but can not?" "Is he guilty who has resolved to emancipate, and is on his way with his slaves to the North for this express purpose?" or "he who lives where it is contrary to the law to manumit on the spot, and is too poor to convey them to another State, or has mortgaged them for security?" &c. He saw that all such suppositions are inapposite to the question, and contents himself with giving such a definition of slavery as comports with his conviction of what is right for him, and therefore, for every other man, to support. For, though he is "unwilling to appear as the eulogist and abettor of slavery, but simply the apologist of an institution transmitted to us by former generations, the existence of which," he says, "I lament,"\* he soon adds, "I do say it is wrong to pronounce it a moral evil and a great crime in the sight of God."† "If slavery be a crime necessarily and essentially, the manner in which it was originated is just nothing at all to the purpose. Slavery is a condition, and if it be one of guilt, then not only is the master bound to clear his skirts of it, without regard to its origin or consequences, but (as with a woman detained in adultery,) it is the duty of the slave—his duty not only to himself but to his master—to revolt and escape."

Here Mr. F. frankly and fully admits the correctness and propriety of the abolition doctrines and measures, as held and practiced by the "ultraists," if slavery, in his own definition of it, is sinful. I as fully grant, that, if slavery is not sinful, taking the same definition of it, our doctrines and measures are all wrong, and ought to be abjured.

---

\* 1st Letter to Mr. W., p. 123.

† p. 129.

I cannot allow this opportunity to pass, without declaring the pleasure I experience in according with Mr. F. in some of his sentiments. "If a good work cannot be carried on by the calm, self-controlled, benevolent spirit of Jesus, then the time for doing it has not come." Perhaps, I might prefer saying, that "then the time for" repenting of wrong feelings, and seeking after the right "spirit" has come; for the good work ought to be done at any "time," but not with a bad "spirit." "The wrath of man" no more "worketh the righteousness of God," in the cause of abolition, I grant, than in holding a slave; and if the "benevolent spirit of Jesus" can, if Jesus himself could, hold a slave, then Mr. F. is doing right in holding slaves, on the terms of his own definition of slavery, which I will soon lay before the reader in his own words. I suppose, however, that Mr. F. would admit that an evil spirit is not more desirable or virtuous in promoting a bad work than a good one.

"That sin must *at once* be abandoned," adds Mr. F., with strictest truth, "is a proposition which admits of no debate. If slavery, then, be a sin, it should at once be abolished"—Here is our doctrine, so bitterly quarrelled with by many at the North,—the ultra abolition doctrine of "immediate emancipation, regardless of all other consequences than may ever be expected to follow from obeying the mandate of the Almighty;" for, if divine truth requires, as we believe it does, that the little word "if," of Mr. F., be stricken out, the doctrine of immediate abolition could not be better expressed than—"Slavery" being "a sin, it should at once be abolished." Mr. F. is no gradualist; and, erroneous in his views of slavery as I regard him, his error is less pernicious than that of many professed haters of slavery, who, while they declare slavery to be "a most horrid sin," inculcate the heresy that this sin, unlike any other, ought not to be abandoned at once, but ought to

be gradually desisted from. I wonder not at the astonishment expressed by Mr. F. that his antagonist should be guilty of such a heresy. Mr. F., in this particular, honors the sacred scriptures far more than his antagonist, who, though calling slavery a sin, had, nevertheless, admitted that God gave special direction to the Jews to hold slaves, and that the apostles permitted slavery, when Mr. F. replies, "WHAT GOD SANCTIONED IN THE OLD TESTAMENT AND PERMITTED IN THE NEW, CANNOT BE SIN." Mr. F. also justly and indignantly rejects the idea that God ever taught the doctrine of "expediency," as it is set forth and commended by Mr. Wayland.

Indeed, there are, in these letters of Mr. Fuller, many valuable truths which were once believed, inculcated, and practiced at the North; but which, in their "over-heated and inconsiderate zeal" and haste to put down the abolitionists, and to persuade the slaveholders of their trustworthiness in their service, (*δουλεία*) the "conservators" have sacrificed, though, as it appears, without attaining their object, either at the North or at the South; for the abolitionists have not been put down, and the slaveholders do not thank these servile men for their unfortunate abandonment of some of the best known and most valuable truths to aid their cause; because they fear, perhaps, lest it will necessarily be thought a bad cause whose support or defence requires such sacrifices. Mr. F. certainly neither thanks Mr. W. nor gives him any honorable credit for the admissions he has made, though he gives him to understand that, in making them, he had surrendered the entire argument. I am now reviewing Mr. F. and not Mr. W., or I might express the sorrow I have invariably felt, since the appearance of these letters, that the defence of freedom had not in this instance fallen into the hands of one who had studied the subject with more care, and was possessed of more of the spirit of William Wilberforce, Lafayette, Thomas

Clarkson, or Toussaint L' Ouverture. The capacious love of man which animated the bosom of either of those truly great men, would have conducted him through the discussion with more of honor to himself, and of safety to the oppressed millions, whose ostensible defender this writer assumed to be, without a call from their real friends. But as the argument has been left in this discussion triumphantly in the hands of the advocate of slavery, the evil must be borne with as much patience as its terrible magnitude will permit. It may, however, seem reasonable that those who have spent many of the best years of their life in toil, and with many sacrifices, and enduring no meagre amount of reproach, to shed light upon the holy cause of human rights, and to retrieve it from the low condition to which "the love of money" and pride, and licentiousness had reduced it, should experience some chagrin on living to see so much of their labor counteracted, and so much of what they had achieved for the slave, wrecked and lost. Just so much more is to be done, before the cause of universal liberty shall be uplifted above the reach of the spoilers, and it must be done. This "Correspondence" renders the duty more imperative.

Triumphant as Mr. F. and his friends may regard his argument, not only over that of Mr. W., but over every other, it may be said, without arrogance, that the simple truth, even in the hand of one much his inferior, is too strong for his ingenious sophistry; and, in humble faith in the God of the oppressed, and devoutly imploring his aid, I shall endeavor to expose that sophistry, and to show that his entire argument is reared on a fallacy, and is, therefore, a failure.

This fallacy is contained in his definition of slavery, and, therefore, I shall subject that definition to a candid and careful scrutiny. It is given by Mr. F. in the following explicit terms: "Slavery is bondage. It is (to give Paley's idea in other lan-

guage) the condition of one to whose service another has a *right*,\* without the consent or contract of the servant. The addition you make to this definition is really included in it, the original right involving, of course, all rights necessarily and properly implied."

In his introductory letter, he had quoted the definition of Dr. Paley, "an obligation to labor for the benefit of the master, without the contract or consent of the slave;" and then remarked, "This is all that enters into the definition of slavery, and what ingredient here is sinful?" p. 7. And he had added a very important explanation, denying that the slavery he approves, necessarily involves the *chattel* relation, "It is by no means an attribute of slavery that a master may treat his slaves as a chattel; the Bible forbids this, and every feeling of our nature rises up and must forever and effectually prevent it." "The slave has his rights, *many* of which are protected by our laws, and all by the Bible." "Property in a slave is *only* a *right* to his service without his consent or contract; and if this be necessarily criminal, then the authority of a father over his child, and of government over its citizens, must be criminal too." p. 9. Fair dealing requires that I allow Mr. Fuller thus fully to explain himself; and, having so done, I return to consider his definition of slavery, quoted from page 130 of the book.

---

\* That Mr. Fuller should have been guilty of thus misrepresenting "Paley's *idea*," is astounding; for "Paley" has given his own "*idea*" *itself* in this "other language:" "Slavery," said Paley, in the year "1780," probably before Mr. F. was born, "is a *dominion* and system of laws the most merciless and tyrannical that were ever tolerated upon the face of the earth." He might as well have said that he gave William Pitt's idea, which was, that "Slavery is incurable injustice. Why is injustice to remain a single hour?" Or that of Grotius—"Those are men-stealers (ἀνδραποδισταῖς, 1 Tim. 1: 10.) who abduct, *keep*, sell or buy slaves."

To come at a correct and full view of his meaning, it seems necessary that I state here what was Mr. Wayland's "addition" to Mr. Fuller's definition, which, the latter says, "is really included in it." "If the master enjoy this right (to oblige the slave to labor for his benefit, without the consent of the slave,) he enjoys," said Mr. W. very correctly, "also the right to use all the means necessary both to enforce and to render it permanent. If this right exist, therefore, I do not perceive that any exception can be taken to the sternest laws which have ever been enacted in any of the Southern States, even though they prohibit, under the severest penalties, the education of the negroes, and forbid them to assemble for the worship of God, except under the strictest surveillance." p. 23. So, then, all this "is really included in" Mr. Fuller's definition of slavery, and is, of course, "*the right*" conferred by God on Mr. F., and all other slaveholders, if slavery is, as he claims, an institution *recta in se*, (essentially good) being established and approved of God.

I regard this as the proper place to take notice of the fact that Mr. F., whatever some of his remarks about "*a material retrenchment*" from this definition may seem to signify to the contrary, goes the whole length in approving and attempting to defend the existing Slavery of this country. His language is strong and even eulogistic of Southern slavery, as the following long quotation amply evinces. "As soon as slavery is mentioned in the North, there is *conjured up*, in the minds of many persons, I know not what confused, revolting combination, and heart-rending spectacle, of chains, and whips, and cruelty, and crime, and wretchedness. But I repeat it, even at the peril of tediousness, that necessarily and essentially—(and in a multitude of instances, practically and actually)—slavery is nothing more than the condition of one who is deprived of political power, and does service, without his contract

or consent, it is true, but yet, it may be, cheerfully and happily, and for a compensation reasonable and certain, paid in modes of return best for the slave himself. With what is strictly physical liberty the master interferes no more, in such cases, than you do with a hired servant. The work assigned is confessedly very light—scarcely one half of that performed by a white laborer with you. When that is performed, the slaves (to use an expression common with them) are ‘their own masters.’ And if you ever allow us the pleasure of seeing you at the South, you will find slaves tilling land for themselves, and selling various articles of merchandise for themselves; and when you inquire of them some explanation, they will speak of their rights, and their property, with as clear a sense of what is due to them, and as much confidence, as they could if free; and tell you (to use another of their phrases) that they do all this in their own time.” pp. 150, 151.

Having given Mr. Wayland this very savory taste of Slavery, than which nothing could be more false to the facts which give to Southern Slavery its general character, and having thus hinted that, as Mr. W. had condemned the Abolitionists, he had proved himself *not one* of them, and, therefore, if he should ever visit “the South,” instead of being “hanged,” he would be received with “pleasure;”—Mr. Fuller proceeds with evident glee—“I hope, my dear brother, I have shown that your ethical argument does not hold good.” p. 151.

That Mr. F. intends to include in his definition of Slavery the existing Slavery of the South, is an essential fact, inasmuch as many readers, among whom is Mr. Wayland, have, by some means, been led to suppose that this is not his view; but that, disapproving the present system as one great “*abuse*” of the morally right and pure “*principle*” of slavery, and, therefore, putting it aside, he would begin anew and cultivate a system worthy, in all its practical details, of that divine



principle. Mr. F. is, consequently, looked upon as a reformer, and, indeed, one of the better sort. Between him and Mr. W., many seem to think, slavery will be demolished. These persons see Mr. Fuller standing near the old tree, axe in hand, ready to hew down the huge, awkward, cragged, mis-shapen thing : they see him eyeing it as a very *Bohon Upaz* bearing the most deadly fruit. The fruit, the branches and the very trunk itself, are all supposed to be odious to Mr. F., as though he regarded what appears above ground as having been engrafted by unwise and even wicked men ; but he says no such thing in all of his letters. They grant that he has fallen into a trifling mistake, perhaps, in averring that the root ("the principle") is good : still this is of little moment, since he condemns "the abuses." But for the grafting, then, the fruit would always have been both delicious and salubrious ; nay, the tree itself would have been pleasant to look upon, and would have spread its cooling foliage over many millions more of "the best conditioned peasantry in the world." Nay, indeed the very grafting seems to be attributable to the fanaticism of the Abolitionists. Such readers have misread Mr. Fuller. Mr. Wayland, in particular, has imputed to him a dislike of slavery which, I doubt not, he would disown, if he were to reply to Mr. Wayland's last letter. The grand premise he sets out with, is that God instituted the relation of master and slave ; and his inference to the undeniable conclusion (if only this premise were sound,) is that the master holds the moral right to govern the slave and use his labor with the profits, without asking the consent of the slave, or allowing him to be a party to the contract, the only parties to which are God and the master, as in the case of parent and child—of civil government and subjects. This is Mr. Fuller's illustration. Now, then, he must show that God institutes and authorizes the slavholding power as He does

parental and civil authority, before he can prove the rightfulness of the relation of owner and slave. Mr. Fuller's argument involved in his illustration proves too much ; since, if from the right of the parent to the service of his child during his minority, and the parent's right to coerce that service, it is legitimately inferrible that the slaveholder has the right to coerce the slave to labor for him, the same inference applies to coerced labor of any other man as well as of the man now claimed as a slave, for it is easy to claim the service of any other man, and then the same right would be established on the same principle. And his comparison of the slave to the subject of State government, is equally unfortunate, since, as it is truly averred in the Declaration of Independence, such government "derives its *just* powers from the *consent* of the governed" which Mr. F. admits is not the fact in the case of the slave.

If, however, it could be shown that God ever did establish the relation of master (owner) and slave, we would now only have to ascertain who are the appointed masters and slaves, as we know who are parents and children, and all controversy would cease. Mr. F. is undoubtedly right in denying that slavery is *malum in se*, a moral *evil in itself*, if God ever instituted it, as he did institute the parental relation. He can, then, institute it among any other people, as it is averred he did among the Jews. In the times of Abraham and Moses, he often made known his will by direct revelation, as by an audible voice from heaven, and in visions, and by inspiration ; but now, since these modes are supplanted by his written word and his providence, if his word establishes the principle of slavery, his providence may sufficiently indicate the persons who may rightfully own and be owned, or hold and be held, as master and slave.

I may here remark that I am unable to see any good reason for the distinction Mr. F. seems desirous of making, asserting that slaves are rightful property, but objecting to the application to them of the word "chattels," which the laws of his own State expressly make them, and which they must be, so long as they are slaves, property to be bought and sold just like any other chattels; and he contends that the Bible gives authority to buy, hold and sell, "transfer," them as "property." How then, can he make it appear that the Bible forbids chattelizing a man? This is obviously a mere quibble unworthy of a logician.

But we have another remarkable statement which is, by no means, a quibble, but is the directest contradiction and the grossest absurdity. "A right to the service of a man without his consent or contract," says Mr. F., "conveys no additional rights but those proper and necessary to this original right. But it is not proper and necessary to this original right that a human being be deprived of any right which is justly his, as an immortal, intelligent, moral, social and fallen creature. Therefore, a right to the services of a man, does not justify any wrong done to his mind, or soul, or domestic relations." Is no wrong done "to his mind, or soul, or domestic relations" in the very fact of "urging him to labor for another by a violent motive, without his contract or consent?" Does Mr. F. see clearly in what way he himself could so be dealt with, without any wrong done to "his mind, or soul, or domestic relations?" The case of the child laboring for his father is infinitely different; for, though coerced, it may be, "by a violent motive," to do his father service, that very service is not for the father's benefit alone, but is designed of God, the benevolent institutor of this relation, to result in the greatest good of the child through the kind discipline of the father, the intellectual and moral training he is required to exercise

towards the child, together with ample provision for his health and comfort, while under the parental control, and with heirship to the property he is earning. But who will pretend that there exists in the slaveholder's heart any such principle as parental love? or that such intellectual or moral training can ever be secured to the slave as parental love secures to the child? or that such care for his health and comfort will be rendered to a slave, where the chief end of holding a slave, young or old, is the emolument of the owner, as parental love spontaneously bestows? or that a slave is ever a lawful heir to the property he accumulates? It is worse than folly to attempt to make the cases parallel to any extent whatever. To place the most unnatural of all possible relations, which by Mr. Fuller's own definition is the product of *violence*, side by side with the most natural and endearing of all relations founded in the very constitution of man and so ordered as, more than any thing else, to secure the happiness and improvement of children, instead of proving any analogy, evinces most clearly the infinite disparity. It is like placing beauty by deformity, virtue by vice, truth by error, heaven by hell, for the purpose of proving that there is between them no essential difference; it only elevates the good and the lovely, and makes more conspicuous the evil and the odious. Nevertheless, Mr. Wayland, commenting on this passage in Mr. Fuller, says: "This, I confess, is to me a new view of the institution of domestic slavery, and I must add that it pleases me incomparably better than any that I have ever seen. Slavery, according to this definition, confers on the master no right whatever, beyond *merely that* of obliging the slave to labor."

"*Merely that—it pleases me incomparably better,*" &c. This is a trifle surely—to be "*obliged to labor*" for "another, urged by a violent motive, without consent or contract," during a whole life—"merely that"!!—very pleasing! and a

very "*new* view of domestic slavery," too! The reader may weep that he was not born to such beatitudes.

But, seriously, what there is "new" in the "view" given by Mr. F., I do not perceive; and Mr. W. and others are at liberty to ascribe this acknowledgment to my want of intellectual acumen. To me it is the same old "view" always held by slaveholders, or rather it is the defense of their "right" of holding slaves, which has always been given by them. In what essential particular does Mr. Fuller's definition differ from the common definitions given by individuals and legislatures? According to Dr. Johnson, "*slave* signifies one mancipated (taken or seized by the hand) or sold to a master." The code of South Carolina requires that "slaves shall be deemed, sold, taken and reputed to be chattels personal in the hands of their owners and possessors, their executors, administrators and assigns, to all intents, constructions and purposes whatsoever." See laws of S. C.; Stroud, p. 22. That "the rights (powers) proper and necessary to (maintain) the original right" of holding a man as a slave, comprehend all that the definition of Johnson and the laws of South Carolina assert, can not be denied by Mr. F., since he involves in the "rights necessary," the right of "transfer" or sale, and of prohibiting literary instruction.

That which to Mr. W. is so "new," and gives him so much pleasure, to me is the same old scheme employed by men time immemorial, for the purpose, first of making the wrongs they perpetrate seem to themselves right, and then, of persuading the rest of mankind to look with favor or at least with mitigated severity on their practices. Indeed, what other ground could the slaveholder occupy? It is, in fact, the ground occupied alike by all those who, in any degree, respect religious obligation, and yet adhere to some practice which, by candid and uninterested men, is esteemed a settled immorality; for.

if there were no way to shield themselves against a like conviction of its immoral nature, their conscience accusing them of guilt, they see that its abandonment is inevitable. And who, that exists in the present imperfect state of humanity, is ignorant of frequent and spirit-stirring assaults, under such circumstances, of motives of interest, ease, wealth, pride, pleasure? These beset us all, "*semper et ubique*," and, as a mighty besieging force, they invest the city day and night, vigilantly waiting for an opportune occasion, the sleep of a sentinel, the opening of a gate, the falling of an undermined section in the wall, or cautiously essaying the sinking of a mine, or patiently continuing the siege, till want keen and irresistible shall take part with the assailants and counsel a surrender. It is no calumny, therefore, to suppose Mr. F. exposed, like other men, to such moral enemies. To suppose otherwise, would strangely elevate him above the common liabilities of peccable mortals. No man would ask me to make such a concession. An apostle was aware of "a law in his members, warring against the law of his mind" and sometimes successfully.\* I only desire that neither the reader nor Mr. F. himself will place him above the possibility of

---

\* Mr. F. seems to be himself aware of the power of circumstances, instead of truth, in making him a slaveholder and keeping him so. This is not the first time he has "done battle" for slavery. In the year 1840, he appeared in reply to an Address to the South sent out by the American Baptist Anti-slavery Convention. In that reply he says, "I am confident, had I been born in Boston, or New York, I would think as they (the Abolitionists) do." In this he went farther in his reverence for the power of circumstances than facts seem to warrant, since many a Bostonian and other citizen of the North were in 1840, and are in 1847, as much in error as Mr. F. touching this subject; and no small number born and educated in the midst of Southern institutions and glued to slavery by interest, as Brisbane, Birney, and many others, have broken loose from its enchantments and become what Mr. F. calls them, "violent Abolitionists." It is not impossible that Mr. F. may join them yet, if his Northern friends will let him; and, if he should, he would be among the most "violent" of them all, having more guilt accumulated to act upon his conscience than most others, on account of his zealous advocacy of slavery under his superior light.

error or hold him impeccable. A slaveholder may fall into error and sin as another man. This I consider in point here, because of the peculiar boldness and stringency of his denunciations of Abolitionists (by no means including Mr. W. or the Editor of the Reflector, however,) for his tone is that of one speaking *ex cathedra* or uttering truths oracular. In his letter introductory to the discussion with Mr. W., he is very direct and explicit, and I am glad of it. "The Abolitionists," he gravely observes, "are not among those with whom we can associate. They occupy a position hostile alike to us and to the word of God, and to every principle of charity." So it appears that, in writing to the Reflector (the Reflector bore it meekly) and to Mr. W., who bowed assent, he was not associating with Abolitionists. This is as true as any thing in his letters. But hear him farther—"people who are essentially monomaniacs—with whom neither you" (the Editor of the Christian Reflector) "nor any body at the North, who loves Christ and the gospel better than self and strife and fanatical intolerance, will long be able to harmonize." p. 12. Very gentle and modest! It is not strange that the Reflector and Mr. W. sweetly acquiesced. "*Par nobile fratrum!*" In all this, the tone of Mr. F. is that of one free from doubt—certain that in so treating us, he "was doing God service." Whether, like "Saul of Tarsus," he is destined hereafter to retract his accusations of the disciples of Christ, it does not become the denounced to determine. God knows, and future historians will, probably, set the matter right. This is all we ask. We are, at present, cashiered—looked down upon as unworthy of being "associates" of *such men as Mr. F., the Editor of the Reflector, Mr. W. and "any body at the North, who"* &c.\* In return, I will not even venture so much as to

---

\* In the "reply" alluded to in the previous Note, speaking of the kind

look up and ask, whether we (the thousands of men and women who remain faithful to the slave) do, indeed, merit this treatment at the hands of Mr. F. ?—or whether either he or his cheerful endorser, Mr. W., is aware of “the spirit he is of”? One thing is, however, too obvious to be questioned—our right, in self-defense and in defense of truth and of the character of the God of justice, to demonstrate, if we are able, the unsoundness of his general positions. This we shall not be able to do, if the truth is not on our side; but, if it is with us, GOD is with us, and the task is, at least, possible.

It is high time the truth were every where known on the subject of slavery. This is evinced in a hundred forms, and in no way more clearly than by the fact, which no longer admits of denial, that men calling themselves Christians, now stand ranged on opposite sides, each party publicly declaring the other not only erroneous, but supremely so. If an observing world of skeptical persons take the testimony of these parties in the American Churches as worthy of credit, they must conclude the whole to be corrupt, and too corrupt to be the proper exponents of a pure religion.

Mr. F. is right in saying “that a clear and conclusive declaration of Jehovah’s will would have been given, if slavery be an awful sin.” And on a parallel, I remark that, if slaveholding be a virtue, a no less “clear and conclusive declaration” would have been given. And yet without any such “declaration” in support of the practice and with the utmost possible “clear declaration of Jehovah’s will against it,” Mr. F. asserts the divine right—the divine approval, of slavery;

---

of missionaries he supposed the “American Baptist Anti-slavery Convention” desired to send to the South, Mr. F. says: “Missionaries—not of the Gospel of God; but of hatred, and insubordination, and bloodshed.” Indeed, he went so far as to charge, that we had “warned” the South that we would send such Missionaries. If we ever did give such an intimation, or indulge such an intention, we must have been very wicked men.



and many others do the same, as *R. Furman*, D. D., formerly of South Carolina, *Thornton Stringfellow*, a Baptist minister in Virginia, &c. Mr. F., in the reply before mentioned in my Notes, says—"The Holy Ghost, after his (Christ's) ascent, expressly authorized slavery. We view your language, as offering direct insult to the unchangeable and Holy One of Heaven." Thornton Stringfellow asserts that "slavery received the sanction of the Almighty in the Patriarchal age, and that gospel fellowship is not to be entertained with persons who will not consent to it." In perfect harmony with this strain of denunciation, a Baptist minister, of the South, has denounced the speaking against slavery as a "sin against the Holy Ghost." On the other hand, the imputation of slavery to God, as its author, or institutor, or approver, has been declared to be "blasphemy" by too many to be enumerated. Then, there are Northern men, who, with Mr. W., "admit that the Patriarchs held slaves," and the Mosaic law tolerated slavery, and the primitive Christian Churches admitted slaveholders as good brethren; at the same time that they do not grant that slavery is right *now*. This latter class do more to bring the Bible into contempt than the slaveholders can, because, while they call it sinful, they admit Bible authority for slavery at some period of the world. And, indeed, all such are held in fellowship by slaveholders and reciprocate the kindness. Others at the North go all lengths in supporting slavery as right now. Mr. W. lauds Mr. F. as one of the very best of Christians, and only desires that "all other slaveholders be made just such masters" as he is, and that his "views, so far as he understands them, be carried into practice."

Now it is clear that, unless this reciprocal condemnation be terminated soon, by an acknowledgment of the wrong by the party to which it attaches, and this "gross darkness" be dissi-

pated from the minds of Northern apologists and connivers, Christianity will inevitably fall into general disrepute. I know that observers ought to go beyond the professor of religion to the scriptures themselves, with all questions affecting the purity of the religion contained in these sacred writings; yet "ye are the light of the world," is a saying of the Master, and Christians are regarded as bringing out before "the world," in their opinions and practices, "the light" of Christianity. This great question must, then, be settled—whether the Bible does approve or condemn slavery, as defined and advocated by Mr. Fuller. To what more solemn, or momentous, or profitable labor can, therefore, the friend of God, of truth, and of humanity devote himself?

It is not a question for us to moot, whether the principle of slavery, as stated by Mr. F., seeks any approval in the great *principia*, or fundamental laws of natural religion which establish the original or constitutional rights of man, as natural justice and benevolence. All agree that by *these* slavery does not and could not exist. Mr. F. himself evidently admits this, for he says to Mr. W., "I am unwilling to appear in any controversy, which can, even by implication, place me in a *false* and odious attitude, representing me as the *eulogist and abettor* of slavery, and not as simply the apologist of an institution transmitted to us by a former generation, the existence of which I *lament*; for the commencement of which I am not at all responsible; for the extinction of which I am willing to make greater sacrifices than any abolitionist has made or would make, if the cause of true humanity would thus be advanced." This certainly looks like a condemnation of slavery; yet, strange as it must seem to every one, Mr. F. then goes on—"but which, for all that, I do say it is wrong to pronounce a *moral evil* and a great crime in the sight of God." In his *reply* several times before named in my Notes,

Mr. F. used the following explicit language—"If the question were a political one, about reducing a free people to servitude, I should oppose such an act as firmly as any man."

Again, in his letters to Mr. W., "If you had asserted the great danger of confiding such IRRESPONSIBLE POWER in the hands of any man, I should at once have assented"—"speaking *abstractly* of slavery, I do not consider its perpetuation proper, even if it were possible. Nor let any one ask why not perpetuate it, if it be not a sin? The Bible informs what man is, and among such beings, IRRESPONSIBLE POWER is a trust too easily and too frequently abused."

From all we have seen of Mr. Fuller, (and I have not been sparing of quotations from him) we derive the following statement of his opinions: 1st. Slavery is contrary to the original laws of justice and benevolence, and, therefore, ought never to have existed—a free people ought not to be reduced to slavery. 2d. The slave power being despotic, "irresponsible power," can never be safely entrusted to any man, and ought never to be, and, therefore, slavery ought not to exist—it ought never to have been instituted. 3d. The abuses under it are such that it ought not now to be perpetuated, but ought to cease. 4th. God did authorize the holding of slaves, notwithstanding it ought not to have been done; for "irresponsible power" ought not to be vested in any man. 5th. God having committed to me this "irresponsible power" which *ought never* to have been committed to *any man*, I may rightfully use this power, and I think it wrong to call it a sin to use it. 6th. The will of God, instituting, authorizing this relation, is communicated to me in the Sacred Scriptures. 7th. What *I* have declared to be wrong and, therefore, not fit to exist, no man has a right to call wrong and impute the wrong to me; but slavery ought to be imputed wholly to the declared will of God, which is, of course, contrary to the dic-

tates of natural justice and benevolence ; but God has established institutions among men which are contrary to justice and love ; and yet he is the God of justice and love, and requires that every man love his neighbor as himself, or with impartial benevolence :—so that I am authorized by *the Bible* to do that which is contrary to justice and love, and am just and benevolent in so doing, because God authorizes me so to do, which He ought never to have done.

The reader is now, perhaps, prepared to accord to Mr. F. a remarkable unity and consistency of argumentation. He sets out with the assumption, the main and indeed his only premise, that God confers on man the right to employ all the power necessary to urge by a violent motive his fellow men to labor for him, without the contract or consent of the subjected party ; and every step in his argument proceeds on this assumption, and is in perfect keeping with it.

I call Mr. Fuller's premise an assumption, not, however, to imply that he declines an examination and support of this premise ; for I grant that he has labored assiduously, I can not say successfully, to *prove* the assumption, by appeals to the Scriptures. Now we have already seen that, in case he should prove that the Scriptures do sanction slavery by any establishment of it, he would only prove, according to his own showing, that they establish that which is unjust. But it will be remembered that Mr. F. has forbidden us to inquire what revelation God would make, and so forecloses all trial of the Scriptures as being a revelation from God, on that strongest of all proof of their divine authenticity, their entire conformity with the principles of natural justice and love, about which, if the Bible itself states correctly, and if men usually judge accurately, conscience is supposed to have some original power of knowing. Let me refer to that very clear and striking passage in the 2d chapter of Romans, which corroborates that

opinion which man has of himself, as a moral and responsible being. "God—who will render to every man according to his deeds—to the Jew first and also to the Gentile. For there is no respect of persons with God. For as many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law. The Gentiles—are a law unto themselves—which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their *conscience* also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another." *Who display the law's work, or the work required by the law, written on their hearts, their consciousness joining testimony, their reasonings holding judicial trial among themselves to condemnation, or even successfully defending.* A more perspicuous declaration of a constitutional power in the human mind, of discerning right from wrong, could not be uttered, than the Apostle has here written. Indeed, if this power were not possessed by man, he could not be a moral being, a subject of law, or a responsible agent. This power of the mind is analogous to the power of vision in the eye, each requiring light in order to perceive objects, and, under the providence of God, being furnished with light adapted to the nature of the corporeal organ, or the mental faculty. So constituted and so circumstanced, man is capable of judging of the claims set up by the *Bible*, the *Koran*, the *Shaster*, or other book, to be a revelation from God.

Mr. Fuller says that "neither *Paley*, nor any writer on natural theology, has advanced a single idea which had not been advanced long before the Christian era." p. 211. He does not presume to aver, however, that every thing advanced by these writers is true or in agreement with natural justice, which is the only legitimate source of the rights and duties of man. It is true that, "long before the Christian era," the

natural and only proper idea of right had been perverted, and that which was wrong, because unjust, and which, on that account, the "just God" could never make right, had been put for right, in the Scripture sense of "putting darkness for light, and calling evil good." Isa. v. 20. So it is possible to call the bright noonday light darkness, and the deepest shades of midnight light; but that would not make any essential change in them. It is in this sense I mean to be understood, when I say that God could not make a natural wrong a right. He could never, therefore, by statute or precept, give to any man the "right" of being unjust. He himself does not and never can possess the right of being unjust, and, therefore, can not impart such right to another being. We see here how preposterous it is to employ the word *right* as Mr. F. does, for to exercise "*the right*" of being unjust, is the greatest *wrong*. If we could suppose God capable of being unjust or of giving license to one of his subjects of dealing unjustly with another, he would, in our esteem, instantly lose the character of being "just and holy," as we now reverently regard him. So, then, it needs not be further urged that we, and mankind everywhere, are constitutionally possessed of the power of determining, in all cases which come within the circle now supposed, what God has not established as right, because he could not do it, without being false to his own eternal and immutably holy principles of righteousness. "God can not lie." Titus 1: 2. "He can not deny himself." See, also, Mr. F. quoted p. 20.

As the Creator of men, God did give to every one of them a love of liberty; in other words, the propensity to seek their own good or happiness, which necessarily associates an unwillingness to be thwarted in that pursuit by any unjust interference of another. In perfect harmony with the proper indulgence of this constitutional propensity, to restrain it within the limits of social justice and to secure its rights, God gave the

“golden rule” and authoritatively established it as one of the two great Constitutional principles, under and in undeviating agreement with which he would and did enact every specific statute,—“*Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.*” Now who believes that, in any one of all his specific enactments, the “*Just God*” has infringed the principle involved in this Constitutional law? The governments of this world, at the same time that they have, without exception, *professed* to adhere to the principle of justice, have, every one, more or less, departed, as all know, from their professions. Our own national government is *Constitutionally* based on this principle. It was declared in 1776, in the clear, unequivocal and strong language of that great State paper which lies now where our fathers laid it, call it “only a rhetorical flourish” or what you will, at the foundation of the government of these States. For some time, it was all the Constitution we had; and until it shall be as formally repudiated as it was adopted, whatever frame of government we choose to build, we rear on that same foundation, solemnly appealing to God for the rectitude of our cause. Accordingly, when in 1789, we reared the frame-work of government, now called “the Constitution of the United States,” instead of upheaving that foundation, we expressly, though briefly recognized its principles in the “Preamble,” leaving it, “the Declaration of Independence,” as the grand political lexicon of that Constitution. We therefore said—“*We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union*” (not to make new distinctions among the inhabitants,) “*establish justice*” (not to subvert it,) “*insure domestic tranquility*” (not to annihilate the family relations, nor make one portion of many families the necessary enemies of another portion, so that the latter should need to go armed by day and sleep on their arms by night, in self-defense,) “*provide for the common defense*” (not to provide

for the defense of one portion of the people only, and plant a standing army over another portion, for the purpose of alienating their “*inalienable’ right to life, LIBERTY, and the pursuit of happiness,*” but for the “common defense” of all in the possession and exercise and enjoyment of all these “self-evident” rights growing out of “self-evident truths,” since nothing is “self-evident” if this is not, that “God hath made of one blood all the nations of men to dwell on the face of all the earth,” and “endowed all men with” these “rights,” and, therefore, it would be unjust and base to leave any of them, among any of “the people of the United States,” unprotected ;)—“*promote the general welfare*” (not to make the welfare of an aristocratic few the end and aim of our social compact, at the terrible cost of the life, liberty and happiness of the many, as, to the disgrace of the mother country and other European nations, has been and is the fact ; for we sincerely design and we made “the Declaration” of our design, in 1776, to prove that Republicanism, that government where the people govern themselves, is better than an Aristocracy, an Oligarchy, a Mixed Monarchy, or a Despotism, under one or the other of which “the whole” political “creation have groaned and travailed together in pain until now”—it is our design to “promote the welfare” of every man, woman and child in the nation ; for, like God, who has given all men these “inalienable rights,” we will be no respecters of persons, but whosoever “out of every nation,” who shall demean himself as a good citizen, shall find in “this land of the free,” a “home,” and all of us ready to promote his welfare ;)—“*and secure the blessings of LIBERTY to ourselves and our posterity*” (not to secure these blessings which we esteem and which it is in the nature of “all men” to esteem above price, above life itself—for we have thrown aside the fear of death to assert this “inalienable right of all



men"—not to secure these blessings to a part, but to the whole,—not "to ourselves" only, but "to our posterity" also, making no distinction between them on account of their *maternal* descent, or other circumstances ;) "*do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States of America.*" If, therefore, through error, any article in this framework of government shall be found to infract or in any degree depart from these great and sacred principles or fail of securing these ends, or if any statute shall be enacted inconsistent with them, that article shall be regarded as no part of this Constitution, and that law "shall be null and void."

So reads "the Preamble of the American Constitution :"—so just are, therefore, the Principles of this government, and so solemnly avowed before a "Just God" and a jealous and an observing world.

Yet, is it not true that not one of these avowed principles of eternal "justice" has been carried out in *the administration* of the government? "Look and see, for out of" these principles "ariseth no" slavery—above all, none to the *mulatto* and other "*posterity*" alluded to. Shame and confusion of face verily belong to a nation practically so false to their most solemn convictions and avowal of righteous principles and purposes. But, as I have said, it is not so with the government of God. "As for God, his way is perfect." Well may He inquire—"Are not my ways equal?—are not your ways unequal?" And well may He "denounce," and not be chargeable with uttering "mad denunciations"—"ye have robbed me, even this whole nation—" "Wo unto him who buildeth his house by unrighteousness and his chambers by wrong; who useth his neighbor's service without wages, and giveth him not for his work." "The hire of your laborers who have reaped down your fields, crieth;" "for the laborer is worthy of his hire." "Ye have vexed the poor and needy."

Your Rulers, “in the midst of the land, are like wolves ravenging the prey, to shed blood and to destroy souls, to get *dishonest gain*. And her Prophets have daubed *them* (the Rulers) with untempered mortar, seeing vanity and divining *lies* unto them; saying, THUS SAITH THE LORD GOD, when the Lord hath *not* spoken. The people of the land have used oppression and exercised robbery, and have vexed the poor and needy; yea, they have oppressed the stranger wrongfully. And *I sought for* a man among them to make up the hedge and stand in the gap before me for the land, that I should not destroy it, but I found none. Therefore, have I poured out mine indignation upon them; I have consumed them with the fire of my wrath; *their own way* have I recompensed upon their heads, saith the Lord God.” “Shall I not be avenged upon such a people?”

It is thus that God deals with an oppressive and hypocritical nation. “The nation that will not serve thee (Christ) shall perish.” Isa. 60: 12. It gives me no satisfaction to believe that these denunciations are applicable to either the rulers, the prophets, or the people of my native country; and if, after a calm, sober and thorough investigation of the facts, and an honest comparison of them with the holy and benevolent laws of the government of God, the reader shall be conducted to the conclusion, that they ought not so to be applied, let him visit upon my head the common denunciations of the slaveholder upon “Abolitionists,” and I will not complain. “Let God be true, but every man a liar.” “Fiat justitia, ruat cælum.”

In view of the principles of “right” which I have stated and shown to belong essentially to the government of God, it does not seem to require an uncommon amount of sagacity or other intellectual power to determine whether the definition of slavery, adopted by Mr. F., does or does not contain a fatal sophism in the word “right”—“Slavery is the *right* of the

master to the labor of another, without his contract or consent." In order to be consistent with truth, should not the definition read—*Slavery is the condition of a person WRONGFULLY and UNJUSTLY held and coerced to labor for another without his consent or contract?*—or, excluding the qualifying words, wrongfully and unjustly, let it read—*Slavery is the condition of a person, who without being guilty of crime or misdemeanor, is held by force in the power of another, and urged by a violent motive to labor for him, without the contract or consent of the former, and without reward.*

Still, Mr. Fuller's definition is the common definition of slavery. "*Usus norma loquendi est.*" But, though it is agreeable to common usage, it should be observed that this usage is that originated by slaveholders and *incautiously* adopted by others, until it is heard or read by many who abhor slavery, without any consciousness of the inappropriate locality of the word "*right.*" Probably, to such persons this word so used seems synonymous with authority or power. The absurdity however, of so using the word, will readily appear, if we only say—Slavery in Algiers is the *right* of Algerines to urge *American citizens* by a violent motive to labor for them, without the contract or consent of the slaves. Americans instantly demur at the use of the word "*right*" in *such* connection. They start back with indignation and astonishment at such a desecration of the word "*right.*" *Liberty* is *our* right, and it can never become the right of others to wrest that right from us, for "all men are born free." So used it would be regarded just as incorrect as if it were applied to the *power* of the *thief*, and it should be said that theft is the "*right*" of one man to bear away the property of another, without his contract or consent and to appropriate it to his own use.\* This is precisely Mr. Fuller's "*right*" of

---

\* See the History of the Lacedæmonians.

*Slavery.* And yet I doubt not, even Mr. F. himself, would be as ready as any man to denounce such a misappropriation of the word "right," particularly if *he* were one of the citizens involved in the supposed case. In the same sense, murder is the "*right*" of the murderer to take the life of his fellow man. Slavery is the *right* of one man to wrest or withhold from another his liberty by force; *only this*, says Mr. F., gently and with supreme complacency. Yes, "*merely that*," sweetly responds Mr. Wayland.

Mr. F. seems evidently to think that he has carved down the huge, uncouth monster of slavery with its "*abuses*" to the very innocence and beauty of a sleeping infant, when he says—"We believe that they" (the precepts of Jesus) "reach every *abuse* of slavery; and condemn all intellectual, moral, and domestic injustice. But we do not believe that they make the *relation* itself sinful, or require, as they must do, if it be a crime, its prompt dissolution. \* \* *It will not do*, then, for you (brother Wayland) to conduct the cause as if we had been proved guilty and were put on our defence. This is the ground always taken at the North," &c. p. 166. "Slavery is *nothing more* than the condition of one who is deprived of political power, and does service without his contract or consent, it is true, but yet it may be, cheerfully and happily, and for a compensation reasonable and certain, paid in modes of return best for the slave himself." *Miss Martineau* lets light into a part of this statement, when she says—"I usually found in conversation in the South, that the idea of human rights was—sufficient *subsistence* in return for labor."

This is all—"slavery is nothing more." I will not ask in the case of any other men, whether justice puts "the right" of making both sides of a bargain into the hands of one man, the man of power, to use that right for the other party, "without his contract or consent;" but to Mr. F. I do say with

solemn emphasis—" *Thou art the man!*"—if any man is to be held and treated thus—" *nothing more.*" The mirror to see "the right" is here,—"*Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you (nothing more) do ye unto them.*" With this mirror in his hand, however, he discovers in the slavery of *others* "nothing more" than is sanctioned of God.

But let the reader consider that no man *can* "consent" to be a slave under this definition, ardently as he may desire to be one, because "slavery is *without* the contract or *consent* of the slaves, nothing more." Equally impossible, therefore, it is for one, consistently with the law of Jesus Christ, to "consent or contract" to make *another man* a slave. God *could not* be obeyed by him, if, denying himself as He can not, He should require of any man such consent; because, if the man were, under such requirement, to "*consent or contract*" to be a slave, "nothing more," he would *not be* a slave, because "slavery is nothing more than the condition of one who is deprived, &c., *without* his contract or consent." So Mr. Fuller's slaves can not "contract or consent" to be his slaves; for, the moment they should make such "contract" or give such "*consent,*" their condition would not be *the* condition described in his definition. It is clearly *impossible* for any man to "consent" to be in "the condition" to which "*without consent*" is essential, and, therefore, Mr. F. utters the plainest untruth, when he tells Mr. W., and through him tells the world, that *his slaves consent* to be such. If they do so consent, they are not slaves, but freemen, who have contracted or consented to labor for him for compensation; and yet they are, by the laws of South Carolina and the claim of Mr. F., his slaves. They are, then, *slaves no slaves.*

If Mr. F. can make out a more monstrous absurdity than this, by *piling* inference upon inference, which he calls

“*sorites*,” he may be able to show that he utters “nothing more” than the truth in asserting that it is the duty of any man to “consent” to be what, if he should consent to be, he would *not* be. With due respect for Mr. Fuller’s logical ability, I may, without arrogance, challenge his demonstration, by argumentum ad absurdum, a priori, a fortiori, or any other form of argument, of any one illegitimate inference I have drawn from the premises with which he has furnished me.

And yet this talented writer (perhaps, I ought rather to say ingenious, for his ingenuity is evidently too much for Mr. Wayland to cope with) rushes with his own definition to the word of God, thinking to find among its moral laws some “express precept” requiring *slaves* to submit themselves, (“*consent*”) and obey their masters in all things; whereas, if such a precept were found there, and the slave should, out of the fear of God or from any other motive, “consent” to be a *slave* and “care not for it,” from that moment he would not be in “the condition” of a slave, as described by Mr. Fuller, as for some time back the reader has seen.

Observe the confidence with which, however, he appeals to the Scriptures and the compliment (not “denunciation?”) he bestows on whoever may venture to confront him. “*He who says, it*” (slavery) “*is a sin,*” he avers, “*will answer to God whom he affronts and not to me.*” Certainly, “when contending with” such a spirit as this, I will “not bring against him a railing accusation,” but, taking the appeal he suggests, I do solemnly say—“*The LORD rebuke thee.*” I do humbly look up to thee, O thou, who art the God of justice and love,—who hast forbidden every form of oppression and required that all men “do justly, love mercy and walk humbly with God,”—who hast expressly commanded the oppressor to “let the oppressed go free and break every yoke,”—who hast pronounced a “woe” upon every one “who useth his neighbor’s service without wages,” and commandest that the em-

ployer shall "give unto the servant that which is *just and equal*," declaring that "the laborer is worthy of his hire" or "wages,"—who hast declared that the time shall come when no man shall buy any more the merchandize of those who traffic in "the bodies and souls of men;"—rebuke the proud; vindicate thine own justice and the honor of thy throne, in imparting to *this oppressor* and to all of his associates in that great sin which thy holy soul abhorreth, light equal to their darkness; and lead them and all of us not into temptation, but deliver them and us from evil, that "thy way may be known upon earth," and that "the man of the earth may no more oppress;"—"for thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory, forever; Amen."

That righteous God, whom I thus address, has long ago taught me thus to pray; and in thus appealing from man, whose breath is in his nostrils, to Him, I always feel approved by Him. But who will dare approach His throne and pray that "Slavery" may continue one year more, or another hour? God has made it my duty and that of every other man to exert that measure of influence with which we are invested, to "deliver the *spoiled* out of the hand of the oppressor;" and I, therefore, implore His aid in accomplishing the task, while I humbly "consent" to enter the field at his bidding, *not as His slave*, but as "free in Christ Jesus," to labor "as under my great TASK-MASTER'S eye."

In the prosecution of this duty, I shall next examine Mr. Fuller's scripture argument. I shall do this, by no means, for the purpose of proving slavery always and everywhere a sin, for this is already sufficiently manifest, by simply contrasting "the condition" of a slave, every *slave*, with that condition vouchsafed to all men by the endowment of their Creator, on the principle of natural, eternal, unalterable justice or right, as well as by explicit written revelation. My purpose is, then,

to vindicate the Sacred Scriptures, which their Author has placed in my hands as the only and the sufficient rule of faith and practice, both for myself and all men, and which He has made it my duty, as a minister of Christ, to explain and teach to my fellow men, Mr. Fuller not excepted, so far as my ability extends;—to vindicate this book of God from the imputation to it, that in any way,—in its doctrines, its precepts, or the language by which these are communicated to mankind, it gives any countenance to *Slavery*, in any form whatever.

Here again I am constrained to express the pain I feel on meeting in Mr. Fuller's Letters so much of that which I can not but regard as arrogant assumption and disrespectful treatment of men whose opportunities for obtaining knowledge in "philology and history" have been as good as his own, and who are prepared to examine both in open day before the world.

Mr. F., moreover, deals in assertions for which he has no authority, touching the manner in which "The Abolitionists" are disposed to discuss the subject of slavery. Hear him: "The assertion just mentioned as to the inherent guilt of slavery, is the distinctive article with modern abolitionists. But after studying the subject in all its bearings, they have clearly perceived that, if the Hebrew and Greek terms rendered servant in our Bibles really signify slave, there is an end either of their dogma or of submission to the scriptures. Hence, after trying in vain the whole apparatus of exigetical torture, they have, with, I believe, much unanimity, set all philology and history at defiance, and resolutely deny that such is the import of those words." p. 167.

The structure of this statement is designed to convey the implication that abolitionists have been driven to the wall by their antagonists, and, there being deprived of their weapons, particularly "philology and history," and even having these



turned against them, they can do no more than stand and "defy and resolutely deny." Mr. F. believes that this is the common fact. There are certainly some things which even he can believe without a "thus saith the Lord" or any other evidence than such shadowy things as imagination begets. Are we able only to "defy and resolutely deny?"

In a philological inquiry, "what saith the scriptures?" Mr. F. knows that, if a copy of the Bible were put into the hands of a heathen man who had never heard or read of it, or any portion of history having a bearing on what it contains, that heathen would be able, from the scriptures themselves, to gather the mind of God in relation to all of the great principles of the divine government, as they relate to the duties of man towards man. History serves to *illustrate* many things which are there established, but it establishes nothing. The Bible itself contains history enough, taken in connection with the Bible use of words, to enable the reader to understand what their great Author has revealed as the law of conduct towards God and mankind. Authentic profane history contains nothing which is contradictory of or inconsistent with scripture history. Since the Old Testament contains all that is extant of ancient Hebrew literature, it is obvious that Hebrew philology, whether we speak of etymology or use, is necessarily shut up within the limits of the Bible. I see in the fact to which allusion is here made, the wisdom of God; for now, instead of leaving his religion open to perversion by the foisting in upon it of foreign use, he has set bounds by the limits of the language itself. The danger is far less in the case of the *Greek* of the New Testament, because the religion of God having been established in the Old Testament, the key of interpretation is furnished within the entire Bible. For example, the "*virtue*" of the Bible is not the "*virtue*" of either the Greeks or the Romans or the Spartans," but is

defined by the associated religion. In going into the exegesis of the few passages in the New Testament containing the word virtue, what scholar would seek in the writings of native or heathen Greeks for the meaning of Paul or Peter in their use of this term? See Philip. 4: 8. 1 Pet. 2: 9. 2 Pet. 1: 3, 5., ἀρετή (*arete*.) Here the reader is limited to the Bible, although numerous contemporaneous or older books exist, having the same word in frequent use. But in ascertaining the signification of Hebrew words, the limitation is more rigid, because no other Hebrew writings of equal age exist, to which it is even possible to make any appeal.

Whether, therefore, we examine into the meaning of the various Greek words which in the English version of the Bible are rendered servant, or the single Hebrew word so rendered, certainly so far as God enjoins or approves the service, the meaning must be sought in the Bible. Who would think of reading Homer to ascertain the signification of the word "God," as applied in the Bible to Jehovah, or of this word Jehovah? Θεός (*Theos*) is often used by the Greeks, but the Theos of the Bible is "the *unknown* God" of the Greeks. To this philological "law and testimony" of the scriptures I, therefore, make my appeal.

In the first place I shall examine the etymology and the use of the Hebrew word (עֲבָד) EBED, sometimes translated servant, and shall endeavor to conduct the examination in such a manner that the mere English reader, as well as the Hebrew scholar, may easily judge of the correctness of the results to which he may be conducted.

I may remark here that there is to every word an etymological or radical meaning. To illustrate my meaning, I give the example of the Etymon or root "*Anim*," frequently used in compound words in English. Take its sense by comparing the following words.

*Anim* means *life*, Latin *anima*, *life*; *Anim-ate*, to impart *life*; *anim-ation*, the action or energy of *life*; *anim-al*, a creature with *life*; *anim-alize*, to produce *life*, or living things; *anim-osity*, hatred with *life*, or living hatred; *anim-advert*, to turn to or upon with *life*. The radical idea of *life*, belongs to each of these words, and the variations in signification are expressed by the adjuncts, *ate—ation—al—alize—osity—advert*. These adjuncts are the varying circumstances.

Analogous to this is the case of a noun without and with adjectives. Take the noun *man*, a good man, bad man, tall man, short man, white man, black man, &c. Though the word *man* applies equally well in each case of all this variety, it means exactly the same thing in every case, the variations being denoted by the adjectives. So the word *laborer*,—a good laborer, a poor laborer, a laborer for himself, a laborer for another, a paid laborer, a free laborer, a slave laborer, &c. The word *laborer* means performer, simply this; yet, by these qualifying words, it is applied to all these various classes of performers. The word *boy* means a male child or youth, but prefix the adjectives or circumstantial words, small, large, young, *old*, and the word is applied to a great variety of persons of different ages.

Sometimes, a word is made to signify differently by the single circumstance of its use by different persons. A parent speaking of his *boy* is understood to mean his *son*; while a slaveholder advertising his runaway *boy*, means his *slave* perhaps fifty years old. But no one will presume to assert that either the word *boy* or the word *laborer* etymologically signifies a *slave*.

Now this is precisely the case with the Hebrew word EBED, as I shall show. Let it be observed that this *noun*, EBED, and the corresponding verb (אָבַד) ABAD have the same orthography in Hebrew, and are distinguished only in pronunciation. God uses this word as a *verb* in the fourth com-

mandment (Exod. 20 and Deut. 5,) in its etymological sense, neither extending its scope nor contracting its meaning, nor in any way limiting its application, except by the time of "six days." "Six days shalt thou *labor*" [ABAD.] So the Septuagint Greek translation has an equally general word, *εργα* (*erga*.) and the Vulgate Latin, *operaberis*. This, without dispute, is the proper meaning of the word ABAD, the meaning it *always* has, when used absolutely or without qualifying circumstances. "Six days shalt thou LABOR"—thou, every person in all ages, "shalt *labor*," i. e. "do all thy work" appropriate to the six days, or for thy secular purposes. For these purposes "thou shalt labor," or be a *laborer* "six days" in every seven. Every person—all mankind ought so to *labor* :—no slave-labor can, therefore, be singled out and enjoined by the word ABAD, more than *any sinful* labor. If slaves were the persons intended, then no persons, but slaves, are under obligation to obey the fourth commandment, which probably Mr. F. himself would hardly be willing to admit. Such, without any other instance of its *use* being necessary, is the etymological and proper meaning of this *verb* ABAD; and, of course, the same is the radical idea of the same word used as a *noun*, EBED, a laborer. This will be placed beyond exception or cavil, if we substitute the phrases, *do labor*, or *be a laborer*, for the word "*labor*"—as "six days shalt thou" *be a laborer*, or *do labor*. The *sense* is not altered. This word is often used as a noun with the same general signification: "Man goeth forth unto his work and to his *labor*." Ps. 104: 23. See Prov. 12: 9 and 11. Eccl. 4: 8 and 9. Ps 90: 10. Prov. 15: 23. Neh. 4: 1, &c.

In all these and many other cases we have the etymological idea. The meaning, in one case, is varied by the circumstance of the labor being bestowed on land for the benefit of himself, the owner and laborer. But nothing is here said or in

any way implied of labor performed by one person for another. I do not deny that the word EBED the noun, or ABAD the verb, may be used to express the *labor* done for another; but, in such case, the fact that it is done for another is signified by some phrase or circumstance connected, not by this word itself. This proves that the word itself never can express or imply that fact, but signifies *only* the simple and single idea of *labor* done, or to *do labor*, or a laborer.

I will, therefore, consult several passages where the word EBED intends one who performs some species of labor for another, or, in other words, a servant. Gen. 24: 34. I am Abraham's servant or laborer. The word EBED signifies no more than a *laborer*; but the circumstance that he says he is a laborer of Abraham renders it proper enough perhaps to translate the word into English by one which does of itself signify that relation, i. e. the word *servant*, though this word is not necessary to the idea intended, *laborer* being sufficient. Gen. 49: 15. Issachar became a servant or laborer *unto tribute*. The words "*unto tribute*" designate what *kind* of laborer he should be—not a *slave* surely, yet, as a punishment for his sins, a *part* of the produce of his labor should be "*tribute*" money. Deut. 23: 15. Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant or *laborer* which is escaped from his master *or employer* unto thee.

1st Sam. 29: 3. Is not this David the servant (*slave?*) of Saul the king of Israel? Same chapter v. 9. What hast thou found in thy servant? (*slave?*) 1st Kings, 11: 26. Jeroboam, Solomon's servant, (*slave?*) lifted up his hand against the king. Jeroboam was a mighty man of valor, and Solomon made him ruler over all the charge of the house of Joseph. V. 32. Solomon shall have one tribe for my servant (*slave?*) David's sake. Gen. 26: 24. And the Lord said—for my servant (*slave?*) Abraham's sake. Num. 12: 7. My

servant (*slave*?) Moses. V. 11. And Aaron said unto Moses, alas, *my lord*. Here Moses, the Lord's *servant*, is Aaron's lord, or *master*, (*slaveholder*?) the word here rendered lord being the common word for *master* Κυριε, (*Kurie*.)

Isa. 42: 1. Behold my *servant*, (*slave*?) whom I uphold, mine elect in whom my soul delighteth: I have put my spirit upon him, he shall bring forth judgment unto the Gentiles. Here the word EBED is applied to the SON OF GOD, as it is also, Zech. 6: 8. Behold, I will bring forth my servant, (*slave*?) THE BRANCH. Now let the reader say whether, if the word EBED had in itself the idea of slavery, taking Mr. Fuller's definition of it, it would be possible so to apply the word as in the last case? Let him think of applying the word *slave* to the same *Adorable Personage*, and the shock he will experience at the obvious impiety and blasphemy which would be inseparable from making such an application, will prove to him how egregious must be the blunder, or the ignorance, or the wickedness, which ever could make the Hebrew word EBED *synonymous* with the word *slave*. Nay, to confine ourselves within a much smaller circle, how guilty of disgracing the Bible would that man be accounted, who should translate the following passages agreeably with that notion. Gen. 50: 17. "We pray thee forgive the trespass of the *slaves* of the God of thy father." Joseph might possibly have "wept when they spake" *thus* "unto him," but his tears would have been shed for the shame he would have felt that his brethren had become so benighted as to think of God as a *slaveholder* and his servants as *slaves*. So, also, render 1st Chron. 6: 49, "according to all that Moses the *slave* of God had commanded:" and Daniel 6: 20, "Daniel *slave* of the living God;" and Job 1: 8 and 2: 3, "hast thou considered my *slave*, Job?" and 1st Kings, 1: 26, "But one, thy *slave* and thy *slave* Solomon." Were Moses and Daniel and

Job *slaves* of God? and was Nathan, the prophet, a slave? and Solomon, David's son, a slave of David? Who, then, are not slaves?—not enough to be the slaveholders.

We have seen that the etymological meaning of the word EBED is a *laborer* and nothing more, and that by the location of the word or the circumstances attending its use, it comes *secondarily* to be *applied* to one who labors or acts for another; but, in no case yet adduced, can it possibly bear to be made synonymous with *slave*. It never can. I freely grant that it may be so connected with qualifying words or phrases, or so associated with circumstances, that it may be applied to a slave in the lowest condition. But *the qualifying terms and the circumstances must be explicit*, for, if not, the etymological being the governing meaning, the presumption must always be that this meaning is retained, until a varied meaning is clearly signified by something out of or extraneous to the word. That this is a law pervading and controlling all language, I need not show to even a sciolist. Every body knows it is so. Call it in question, and you unsettle all language, and render it useless and a mockery. Accordingly, when Noah, awaking from a state of intoxication, as we are told for a warning to other good men “not to look on the wine when it is red,” but “touch not, taste not, handle not,” when that long-trying righteous man and “preacher of righteousness,” awaking from a fit of drunkenness, for he had “drunk of the wine of his vineyard and was drunken,” and having learned that his “younger” (not *youngest*) son, *Ham*, had seen him in that shameful condition and told his brethren—when, under these circumstances, he was filled with chagrin, and would vent his feelings of a very natural dislike to the informer, he singled out *one* of the *four* sons of Ham (see Gen. 10: 6,) and anathematized that one, viz. *Canaan*. His chagrin moved him to pronounce on him the doom of being

a servant of low condition; and, surely, no greater curse could he pronounce upon the fourth son of Ham than the curse of being a *slave*, as it is commonly admitted. As I shall examine this strangely misunderstood and misapplied passage of sacred history in its more proper place, I shall here only remark that the words "*cursed be*" and those which follow the word "*servants*," would seem enough to indicate clearly the *kind* of servant the speaker, at that peculiar moment, desired his grandson *Canaan* might be; and yet he saw that the word EBED, a *laborer*, would not express what he intended, and, therefore, he employed a form well known to belong to the Hebrew language, when the speaker would express himself with extreme emphasis, "a servant of servants," or a low, degraded laborer, or rather, perhaps, a great laborer—"shall he be unto his brethren," &c. Let those who prefer it, say *slave*, I have no objection, so far as this word can have any argumentative bearing. My only object now is to show that, if a slave were intended, it was necessary to use a peculiar *form* of words to express that idea, even in addition to several other words used for that purpose.\*

The case of Joseph now presents itself. The word EBED does by no means prove him to have been sent to Egypt as a slave, for he might have been said to have gone to Egypt as an EBED, a servant, if, on appointment to the office of prime minister of Pharaoh, he had "contracted or consented" to go for that purpose. To prove this I have given sufficient evidence before. But the fact that he was *sold to the Ishmaelitic merchants* does imply that he was carried thither as a slave. See Gen. 37:28; also Ps. 105:17. A slave is *such* an EBED as is *sold, kidnapped, held to service by force*, or

---

\* It is worthy of some notice hereafter, that the very men who defend slavery as a "condition" favorable to the slave and a *blessing*, nevertheless earnestly seek its establishment in the *curse* of Noah.



as Mr. Fuller well expresses it, "*urged by a violent motive to labor for another without his contract or consent.*" Mr. F. will find it necessary to *add this definition* even to the word servant, which, though *not* like the word laborer, is one who in some way labors *for another*, and yet is to be understood of a free person, unless circumstantially qualified and *so* applied to a slave. How much more necessary, then, to add the same definition to the more general word EBED, a *laborer*, in order to show that the laborer, to use the language of South Carolina law, "is in the power of a master to whom he belongs as property, to all intents and purposes whatsoever," and "can possess nothing which does not belong to his master;" for a *slaveholder* may hire a *free* laborer, who would be his *servant* as strictly, while hired, as though he were his slave, and yet would not be his slave, and neither would it do to *call* him a slave.

Here let attention be given to the remarkable fact, that the word EBED is not once translated *slave* in the Bible, this word being used only twice in the English version,—once Jer. 2: 14, where it has *no* corresponding word in the Hebrew, and is, therefore, printed in Italic letters;—and once Rev. 18: 13, where it corresponds with *σωματων* (*somatone*), meaning *bodies*. This word ought to have been rendered *bodies*, and the clause should read—*bodies and souls of men*; undoubtedly both words together meaning slaves in this instance, since it requires both a body and a soul to constitute a slave, a man to be made an article of "merchandize," as men were made by "*Babylon, the mother of harlots.*" But let the slaveholder know that the time is coming, when the prophecy contained in this 18th chapter of the Revelation of John, will be fulfilled. I was about to make a quotation or two from this chapter; but, on giving it a fresh examination, I see it is, as a whole, so applicable to slavery and especially,

to a slavery-sustaining church, like the majority of the churches in America, that I think it better to commend the entire chapter to the attention of the reader; only addressing all professors of Christianity in the words of the great angel by whose glory the earth was enlightened, and who cried mightily with a strong voice—"Babylon the great is fallen ——— come out of her, my people, that ye may not be partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." If God thus enjoins, who shall dare disobey? Will Elder Fuller?

The word Slavery not being in the Bible, I shall proceed to examine the words which are by advocates of slavery *made* to signify slavery, as servitude, service, serve, servile, bondage, bond-servants, bond-maid, man-servant, maid-servant, &c. *Servitude* is used but twice. 2 Chron. x. 4, ease the grievous servitude of thy father—the heavy *labor*, &c., *Kasha* being the qualifying word. Lam. i. 3, because of great servitude, great labor, &c., *Raba* being the qualifying word. *Service* is used many times. A few instances will be sufficient. Gen. xxix. 27, for the service (labor,) thou shalt serve (perform or labor) with (for) me. xxx. 26, for whom I have served (labored for,) thee. Exod. i. 14. And they made their lives bitter with hard bondage (labor,) in mortar and in brick, and in all manner of service (labor,) wherein they made them serve (labor,) with rigor (tyranny, oppression.) Ezra vi. 18, for the service of (labor for) God. Jer. xxii. 13. Wo unto him that buildeth his house by unrighteousness—that useth his neighbor's service (labor,) without wages, (or payment for it,) and giveth him not for his work. It is sufficient to add that this noun and the verb *serve*, are in all cases used in perfect keeping with the word servant, all in Hebrew being of the *same root*, and in no one instance expressing, or implying, within themselves, the idea of slavery, that idea always being suggested by the attending circumstances, wherever it

is associated with the word EBED, ABAD, &c. So also the word *servile* means laborious, but by no means slavish; since, when "servile work" was prohibited on certain sacred days, slaves were not addressed, but the people at large. See Lev. xxiii. 7, 8, Num. xxviii., &c.

Gen. xliv. 33. Let thy *servant* abide instead of the lad, a *bondman*. The circumstances make it proper to translate the word EBED in this passage, first servant, and secondly bondman. When alluding to himself Judah used the word EBED, by way of respect to his superior, as though holding himself in readiness to do *labor* for him, if commanded; and, when he proposes to substitute himself for Benjamin, the idea is that he will remain in labor or service for Joseph. These *circumstances* led the translators to use the two words servant and bondman for the one Hebrew word EBED, which fact evinces the necessity of taking into account all the circumstances attendant on a word, in order to secure an accurate and discrete translation.

It is clear, that the word bondman can mean nothing more than servant may mean; though as the *Egyptians* held slaves, the word EBED is *by this fact*, sometimes understood to mean such a servant as is a slave. The servant of *John C. Calhoun* is presumed to be a slave, for the same reason; whereas the servant of *Daniel Webster* is presumed to be a freeman, because this gentleman is not a slaveholder.

By all the foregoing facts, in the various uses of the word EBED, we are conducted to a truth essential to the correct decision of the question at issue, viz: whether the Bible, *in the words* servant, bondman, &c., contains the authority for holding men in slavery? The truth is that nothing can be determined for or against the practice by the Hebrew word EBED, alone, of which the English words servant, bondman, &c. are the translation. This is all I need to show, in order

to destroy the argument *for* slavery, founded on the supposition that the "*philology*" of the Scriptures necessarily teaches that slavery is of divine authority ; and this I cheerfully submit to the judgment of candid men, as settled against whoever desires to find in the Hebrew word EBED itself, the idea, or a "*color*" of the idea of slavery.

Now, as the Greek word *δουλος* is used in the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament, and in the New Testament, in the same general manner, with the single exception that its etymological idea is that of the word servant—simply a laborer for another person, instead of the broader meaning of EBED; a laborer, whether for himself or another, I need only refer to a few instances of its use to show that it has the general meaning I speak of, and the advocate of slavery may find himself stripped of his Greek armor as he is of his Hebrew.

The following will, I think, accomplish that end. 1 Sam. xxix. 3. David the servant (*doulos*) of Saul. Dan. vi. 20. Daniel, servant (*doulos*) of the living God. Exod. xiv. 31, the Lord and his servant (*therapone*) Moses. Job xlii. 7, as my servant (*therapone*) Job. Isa. xlii. 1, Jacob my servant (*pais*), lii. 13, my servant (*pais*) shall deal prudently. Zech. iii. 8, my servant (*doulos*) the Branch. 1 Sam. iii. 9. Speak, Lord, for thy servant (*doulos*) heareth. 1 Kings viii. 28. Yet have thou respect unto the prayer of thy servant (*doulos*.) Dan. iii. 26. Ye servants (*douloi*) of the Most High God. Acts xvi. 17. These servants (*douloi*) of the Most High God. Rev. vii. 3, sealed the servants (*douloi*) of our God. Rom. i. 1. Paul a servant (*doulos*) of Jesus Christ. 2 Tim. ii. 24, the servant (*doulos*) of the Lord must not strive. 2 Pet. i. 1. Simon Peter a servant (*doulos*) of Jesus Christ. Jude i. 1. Jude the servant (*doulos*) of Jesus Christ. Rev. i. 1. The revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave to him to show to his servants (*douloi*)—signified it by his servant (*doulos*) John. Can *doulos* intend slave here? These could never have

been the uses of the Greek word *doulos*, if the radical idea or meaning had been a slave, as any one may satisfy himself, who will attempt to translate, in all or any part of the passages quoted, this word, by the word slave or slaves. But the radical idea being servant in its unrestricted sense, it is appropriate when applied to freemen, and even to Jesus Christ himself. The use of the word in 1 Cor. vii. 22, is so strikingly illustrative of the views I have given, that I can not omit its quotation entire. "He that is called, being a servant, is the Lord's freeman; likewise, also, he that is called, being free, is *Christ's servant—not slave*, I think. If, in the first clause, the word servant, (*doulos*) means a slave, this can not be true of it at the close of the sentence.

The word may, by associated circumstances, be applied to every species of servants; but the attempt to attach to it the meaning of slave, as its intrinsic signification, is like finding authority for idol worship in the word God, because this word is sometimes, and very often, applied to *the gods* of the heathen, which are vanity and a lie. The word God, in the Bible, is always to be taken as meaning Jehovah, for the reason that it is in the Bible or book of the true God, unless its connection divert it to something else. So, though more emphatically, it is with the Hebrew EBED, a laborer, and *doulos*, a servant, and every other general term used in the Bible; it must be taken in its independent or leading sense, until limited or varied by associated circumstances, and then, the strongest leading circumstance is, that *it is in the Bible*, and is to have the Bible sense, unless otherwise defined by special connected circumstances. In pursuing the review of Mr. Fuller's argument, I shall expect to find that argument running parallel with this principle, or exercise the liberty of exposing its departure from it. Of this he can not reasonably complain.

What he intends by charging Abolitionists with setting at defiance all history, as well as philology, is too obscure to

allow of more than a very faint conjecture. If his imagination has seen any of us even disposed to deny that slavery did exist, and extensively prevail as far back as the times of the apostles, or Moses, or even Abraham, he has certainly experienced a singular hallucination. In what of all the teachings of history, however, does he get proof that Abraham was a slaveholder? or Isaac? or Jacob? or Joseph? or Moses? or Joshua? or Samuel? or David? or Solomon? or Isaiah? or Malachi? or Joseph the husband of Mary? or JESUS CHRIST? or Peter? or Paul? or any of the patriarchs, or prophets, or apostles, or primitive Christians? Here I do confess myself ignorant of any *historical* proof that those men of God were, any of them, slaveholders. In order to be such, their servants must have been "urged by a violent motive to labor for them without contract or consent." "It will not do then, for" Mr. Fuller "to conduct the cause, as if" Abraham and the rest "had been proved guilty of holding slaves, and were put on" their "defense. This is the ground always taken at the" *South*, "and because" Northern "*Christians* reply with the Bible in their hands, they are misunderstood. p. 166. "He is bound to make out" his "case, and prove" them "guilty." I do "resolutely deny" that they were, and that he has shown a particle of proof of the fact; but he has "resolutely" asserted that they were, and Mr. Wayland, rather his coadjutor than antagonist, has admitted it, and, also, that the Abolitionists are just as guilty as Mr. Fuller describes them. p. 49.

I cheerfully admit that Abraham had *servants*, but *not slaves*; and, as I am left to "prove a negative," I shall endeavor to ascertain the circumstances which preclude the propriety of calling Abraham's servants *slaves*; and then go on to others who stand accused of the same practice. "History" gives us some information of the nature of the patriarchal govern-

ment ; and the sacred " history " of Abraham is by no means silent touching the relations he sustained to his servants.

What I shall prove, is, that the subjects of the ancient patriarchal government were voluntary, and, therefore, free subjects, not slaves. I shall, in the first place, consider what the Scriptures say on this subject. No proof is needed that the entire power for enforcing the authority of a patriarch, was limited to himself in his own proper person ; i. e., there was no power *behind* himself, like the power of state government standing ready, in case any of his subjects should mutiny or rebel, to suppress the mutiny or rebellion, and cōerce them into obedience. If any analogy is to be found between the patriarch with his subjects, and the slaveholder with his slaves, it must be sought in supposing a case, which is, after all, essentially unlike that of any slaveholder in the world. The supposition is, that a slaveholder asserts his authority over his slaves without any state law giving him authority so to do, or to inflict punishment on them for a disobedience of his will. As though a slaveholder were to take with him a thousand or more slaves, men, women and children, and were to remove to some region uninhabited and claimed by no government whatever, say some island so circumstanced, or if there were inhabitants, they were such as himself and his slaves, and these acknowledged no allegiance to any government, and sought protection from none ; neither had they combined to form any compact among themselves, but, at most, entered into a confederacy, not to keep each other's subjects in subjection, but to strengthen themselves against a common *foreign* enemy, or rather to preserve peace between the people or tribes, lest they should commit depredations upon each other's property, or interfere with each other's rights. See the case of Abraham and Abimelech, Gen. xxi., of Abraham and Lot, Gen. xiii., Isaac and Abimelech, Gen.

xxvi., Abraham and Lot, Gen. xiv. 12—16, Abraham and Melchizedek, same chap. 18—24. Each slaveholder is the sole governor of his slaves. Our slaveholder removes into such an island or other place, and there, unaided of course, he undertakes to “urge his slaves by violent motives,” as the whip, the stocks, &c., “to labor for him without their contract or consent.” Let it be “just such a slaveholder as” Mr. *Fuller*—nay, let it be himself. Now, since he says that the slaveholder’s right “does not deprive the slave of any right which is justly his, as an immortal, intelligent, moral, *social*, and fallen creature,” [see p. 152.] let him collect his slaves around him, and distinctly make known to them his views on these points, and then add, that no man, *the Bible tells him*, ought ever to be entrusted with irresponsible power, and, therefore, he does not consider the perpetuation of slavery proper, even if it be possible, [see p. 157,] but that these are his slaves, and by the Bible, *rightfully* such; that he intends to hold them as such, and to “urge them by a violent motive to labor for him, without their contract or consent, it is true,” and that he shall compensate them for their labor in modes best suited to their conditions, *he being the sole judge* of these things. He then orders a part of them to one spot, and others to another spot, to cultivate cotton, rice, corn or other crop. But, instead of obeying these orders, they begin to demur, and “as intelligent, moral, social, and *fallen* creatures,” they assert the right to regulate *their own* “social” relations, and proceed to depose him from the dignity and authority he has asserted over them. This is quite as supposable as any other part of the supposition. To the use of *what* “violent motive” will Mr. Fuller resort to “urge” them “to labor for him?” He will, as a slaveholder, seize the *common* “violent motive,” the whip, and deal about him the punishment required in a case of so urgent necessity; surely, no case of greater necessity can be



imagined. Among his thousand slaves, are "three hundred and eighteen trained servants." These are his soldiers on whom he relies for protection against the neighboring slaveholders, among whom he has, like *Abraham*, come to dwell. Shall he call out these soldiers, in this emergency, to enforce submission? "Servants, obey your masters in all things." Since God, by an apostle, has thus explicitly enjoined obedience on "*slaves*" (as Mr. Fuller renders the word "servants,") and so conferred "the right" of "urging them to labor by a violent motive," Mr. Fuller must use the power (in this *extreme* case, if ever,) and he does, like Abraham, "arm his trained servants, three hundred and eighteen men," and command them to assist him in reducing the rebels to submission. Like the servants of Abraham, they are all armed with bows and arrows, or, like the soldiers of modern times, with muskets. They must make a deadly onslaught upon those rebel slaves, if they attack them. But, to the amazement of their kind master, (perhaps, I ought rather to say, to the amazement of Mr. Fuller *now*,) no rebels are to be found, except the women and children of these three hundred and eighteen soldiers, for these very soldiers are, themselves, the mutinous and rebellious slaves? Shall they *fire* upon their own wives and children? Sad necessity this! since Mr. Fuller is so faithful to the "domestic relations" of his slaves, and would defend them at every hazard.

But who shall reduce the *rebels*, even though the women and children should all be put to death by their husbands, and fathers, and brothers? Why, these soldiers must now turn their weapons on *themselves*; for obedience must be enforced, where God has by his "Spirit expressly authorized slavery," and required the slave to obey his master, even though he be "froward." So the three hundred and eighteen slaves, learning, from their kind master, their duty to God and him, first

destroy their wives and children, and then themselves. So their master, Mr. Fuller, is obeyed, and stands alone triumphant over the rebels, still holding aloft with becoming dignity the ensign of his authority, and the "violent motive" by which the fearful rebellion has been quelled, viz. a long whip. The Bible in his left hand gave the authority, and the "violent motive" in his right hand—*did what?* Drive his soldiers to fight and kill each other? But "Abraham held slaves," says Mr. Fuller, and "Abraham held slaves," assents Mr. Wayland, and this Northern man *wonders that any one should doubt it*—he would "almost as soon doubt whether God gave the Moral Law." [p. 49.] I submit to the reader, whether the analogy between the case of the slaveholder and Abraham is so entire as to remove all doubt of that patriarch being a slaveholder. Amazed as Mr. Fuller and Mr. Wayland may be at the absurdities involved in the above supposed case, to themselves, and not to me, they must ascribe those absurdities, for they unavoidably result from any and every attempt like theirs, to run the alleged parallel between slaves and the servants of Abraham, out to its legitimate consequences. They, probably, supposed there was a parallel. Abraham had *servants*, so has Mr. Fuller. So, without stopping to inquire whether those servants were alike, holding the same relation to their respective masters, or being in the same or a like condition, they *assumed* all this, and in the parallel run out, in one particular, I have assumed the same thing, and no more.

What, then, are the circumstances attending the case of Abraham's servants, which determine their condition, not as slaves, but as free, voluntary subjects of the patriarchal government? I have already alluded to some of them. One is the fact, that Abraham was sustained by no power foreign to himself; whereas, every slaveholder in the United States is sus-

tained by the entire power of his state government, backed by the power of all the other slaveholding states, and, if the South are correct in their claims, by the united power of all the states in the land, and even by the power of all the nations of the world who hold confederacy with this nation.

Again: Abraham's "trained servants," three hundred and eighteen in number, so far from being slaves, are, by this very word "trained," *freemen*, the word for "servants" not being found in the corresponding Hebrew. What are we to understand by "trained" but *soldiers* trained? If you will have them trained soldier *slaves*, then furnish Abraham with *the power* to hold them as slaves by his single right arm, and to train them as soldiers, and then "to urge them by a violent motive without their contract or consent," to go forth at his bidding to fight his battles.

If Mr. Fuller should claim that Abraham's soldiers were his captives taken in war, on the strength of the word *nishba*, sometimes rendered in this sense, he must show that our translators were wrong in using the word "trained," and that Abraham, by his own unassisted power, was *able* both to take three hundred and eighteen men captives, and hold them as slaves, which would be a still more absurd supposition than that in the parallel I drew just now, as it involves the power of reducing freemen to slavery, which calls for more power than to hold them when reduced; and Mr. Fuller tells us he would as firmly resist as any man this atrocious procedure. It would make Abraham a mighty "kidnapper," as well as a slaveholder.

Again: the fact that Abraham entrusted the courtship of a wife for his son Isaac, to one of his men, called, indeed, a servant, as he truly was, and as Paul and James and Jude were servants of Jesus Christ, without being his *slaves*, I think, and the gentlemanly manner in which that

servant executed that important errand, as well as the great respect with which Eleazer was treated by Rebecca, who called him "*lord*," drawing the water for his camels with *her own* fair hands, instead of permitting or commanding him to draw it, and his treatment by her family during his visit, pretty clearly indicate, nay, absolutely prove to every candid reader of the Bible, (do they not?) that, instead of being a slave, he occupied in the patriarchate the position of prime minister, being a native of Damascus, and no doubt having accepted the appointment as cheerfully as Daniel Webster did the Secretaryship offered him by President Harrison. In case of Abraham's death without issue, some servant was to succeed to the station of Abraham. "And Abraham said, Behold, to me thou hast given no seed: and, lo, one born in my house is my heir." This man, "Eleazer of Damascus," is by Abraham denominated his "steward," which is equivalent to "Chancellor of the Exchequer" in the British government. *This man a slave?* See Gen. xv. 2, 3. If so, call Abraham a slaveholder, not else, unless you can see good reason for making any other of Abraham's servants to differ so essentially from this, that, while he was a high officer, as well as a freeman, the rest were slaves. Who will show proof of such distinction?

But we may look beyond the single case of Abraham, to Isaac, and Jacob, and "the twelve patriarchs." Were these men slaveholders? Does either Mr. Fuller or Mr. Wayland *believe* they were? And yet both these teachers of divine truth have *said* they were. Was Jacob a slaveholder? Both he and his father had servants; but were these their slaves, when we behold the master, Jacob, hard at work with *his own* hands for a long series of years, in the service of Laban, whom he is said to have "*served*?" There is the same evidence that Jacob was a *slave* of Laban, as that the servants

of Abraham were his slaves. The word EBED is applied to him and to them. Again, therefore, I may ask, who were not slaves, even up to the highest officers of state?—up to the prophets and apostles and the Lord Jesus *himself*! Men reputed for wisdom are certainly liable now, as in the days of Solomon, to have in their character a sprinkling of folly. Eccl. x. 1 and 7. And now let us look at “the twelve patriarchs.” See them going to Egypt again and again for corn, not sending *slaves* for it, as slaveholders would; and at length bringing down into Egypt their father, and their wives and children; and yet, not a word is said of their selling *slaves* even in their extremity, rather than to sell *themselves*, as the best and kindest of slaveholders were never known to fail of doing; for Mr. Fuller and all other advocates of slavery rely much on the words, “for he is his *money*,” in support of their “right” to their slaves as their “*property*.” If this phrase does support that alleged “right,” and if the twelve patriarchs held such property, we should have heard of the sale of “that species of property” in that extremity. But no: they were shepherds, and came into Egypt unattended by any such “property.” Yet we hear nothing of the abolition of slavery among them. If, as is probable, they, like their ancestors, had “servants,” free laborers in their patriarchate, they would naturally leave those hired laborers to return to their own people and business. But to dismiss *slaves*, whose bodies and souls would have sold high in slaveholding and slave-trading Egypt, and go down like plain, unattended, self-laboring *Yankees*, and bargain with the *government*, not with slaveholders after all, to sell themselves for a good consideration to labor, as freemen, not to allow themselves to be kidnapped by the powerful Egyptians and “urged by a violent motive to labor for them without their contract or consent,”—all these facts utterly forbid the indulgence of the idea that the “Patri-

archs" were slaveholders, or sustained any relation to their servants, other than that which freemen may, and often do, sustain to each other. In this view all is harmonious and consistent; but the notion that these laborers were slaves, involves, as we have already seen, the greatest inconsistencies and the grossest absurdities.

I may here call attention to the practice, divinely enjoined, of applying to the servants, equally with the children of the patriarchs, the right of circumcision, that "sign" of God's covenant with Abraham and his oath unto Isaac, and which he confirmed unto Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting or perpetual covenant. See 1 Chron. xvi., and Ps. cv.

Let the reader examine the 13th, 15th, and 17th chapters of Genesis, and he will see that, in regard of both temporal and spiritual good embraced in that covenant, the posterity of Abraham were placed on perfect equality with all those persons who, by birth or purchase, became members of their families. Gen. xvii. "This is my covenant—every manchild among you shall be circumcised—it shall be a *token* of the *covenant* betwixt me and you—every manchild in your generations, he that is born in the house or bought with money of the stranger, which is *not* of thy seed—and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting (perpetual) *covenant*,—and the uncircumcised manchild shall be cut off from (denied the privileges of) his people; he hath broken (not conformed to the terms of) my covenant. And Abraham took Ishmael his son, and all that were born in his house, and all that were bought with his money, every male among the *men* of Abraham's house, and circumcised them."

This covenant, whatever spiritual blessings it secured and emblematically signified by the earthly, gave to all, who received the "token" of the covenant, a right to habitation and possession in the land promised to Abraham in it. See Gen.

xiii. and xv. All were to be subjects of the patriarchate, or, as we should say, "naturalized citizens;" but even a son of a patriarch could have no inheritance there, if he bore not the "token." According to the practice under the patriarchate, a servant or subject stood as "heir apparent" until the patriarch had a son; the heirship then fell to him, and the servant or subject remained, if he chose, the subject but not the slave of the son. How sacredly all the natural rights of the subjects, who became such by being "bought with money of the heathen round about," were established and guarded under the Mosaic law, we shall see, when we come to the consideration of that law. The reader should assume nothing in advance of scriptural instruction, but bear along with him what of truth he has gathered up from the Abrahamic covenant which continued in force ever afterwards among that people, and, as *the constitution* of government, pervaded and controlled and illustrated all their laws, whatever outward form the government assumed, under the patriarchs, under Moses as God's viceroy, or "the Judges" which the people elected, or the kings which God consented to place over them. If they disregarded that constitution in their practice, as they often did, it still remained in force, and their disregard of it was always accounted sinful. It is sufficient here to say that under that constitution God was always to be acknowledged as their sovereign, the source of all authority and law. Whatever harmonized with his will was right, and whatever was more or less inconsistent with his will was wrong. The specific forms of government might be indefinitely varied, but the principles of impartial justice and fraternal benevolence could undergo no change.

The patriarchal government was not a novelty in the family of Abraham. "The prevailing form of government during this period" (before the flood) says Yahn, "was probably the

patriarchal. At first (after the flood,) the new race of men seem to have acknowledged the patriarchal (fatherly) authority of Noah and his lineal descendants. But after the dispersion which followed the unsuccessful attempt to build the tower of Babel, Nimrod, the celebrated hunter and hero, laid the foundation of the Babylonian *Kingdom*. The kingdom of Assyria was established soon after. The reign of Menes, the first king of Egypt, commenced about the middle of the second century after the flood. About the same time a second (African) kingdom was founded at Thebes, and about twenty years later, a third at Memphis. In the tenth generation after Noah, while Abraham dwelt in Canaan (from 367 to 467 after the flood,) there were in that country several small states and kingdoms which had been founded by the descendants of *Canaan*, the son of Ham." Among these, though in the land of promise as in a strange land, Abraham lived, "dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob," Heb. xi. 9; though God "gave him none inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on." Acts vii. 5. These facts prove any thing but slavery existing in the family of the patriarch. Call him king, chief, captain, over voluntary followers or subjects, but not a slaveholder "urging" three hundred and eighteen men "to labor for him without their contract or consent." And yet Mr. F. boldly asserts that he *was* a slaveholder, and Mr. W. meekly admits that "Abraham and the patriarchs *had* held slaves many centuries before" the time of Moses, and "*wonders* that any should have the hardihood to deny so plain a matter of record," adding—"I should almost as soon deny the delivery of the ten commandments to Moses." Verily, the poor abolitionists are not the only people who are "almost" ready to give up the Bible as no revelation from God, rather than give up their darling opinions! Here we have "limitations of human responsibility," with an empha-



sis But I am talking out of place, some may think "out of order," of Mr. W., when I should speak only of Mr. Fuller; yet the assimilations between the two writers are, in fact, so intimate that I am "almost" liable to mistake one for the other. And why should I not, when Mr. W. says—"I fear, with you," (did Mr. F. "*fear*?") "that the emancipation of the slaves in the West Indies is not accomplishing what was expected. \* \* \* But aside from this case, all history informs us that *absolute* liberty" (Is *that* the liberty to which the British slaves were restored in the West Indies?) "is too violent a stimulant to be safely administered to a race who have long been bred in slavery. *All I ask* is that the views *you* entertain, so far as I understand them, be carried out into practice." And yet, in the very same letter, he commented on the doctrine set forth by Mr. F. in the following very severe but very merited terms—"This doctrine is really more alarming than any that I have ever known to be inculcated on this subject. It authorizes them to enslave us, just as much as it authorizes us to enslave them." Is this one of Mr. Fuller's "views," Mr. W. so ardently desires to have "carried out into practice?" Why so "alarmed," then? Ah, it would be "alarming," if Mr. F. really meant to involve people of light complexion in the "doctrine;" but, since it is presumable he does not, his "views" may safely to "us" "be carried out into practice," and "all I ask is that" they may be. "We can both unite in the effort to render all slaveholders in this country *just such* masters as YOU."

I can not but ask—is this the triumph of Mr. W. over Mr. F., so loudly trumpeted through the land by certain Baptists? 'Tis the man who has come forth to deliver the cause of abolition from the unwise treatment of the ultraists? 'Tis the only book which has ever been written in the right spirit and with the adequate ability, setting the truth in so strong a

light before the face of Mr. F. and all the slaveholders, that they must be convinced of their sinfulness and repent and put away their slavery? Brethren, had you read these "letters" before you made up your minds that Mr. W. had settled the question against slavery forever? I shall need express no opinion of these letters. They will speak for themselves and for me, before we get through with them. Mr. Fuller writes quite as true a commentary on the real value of Mr. Wayland's argument, as any ultraist would desire to see, when he says—"All half truths are more pernicious than pure falsehood."

The Mosaic law comes next under consideration.

Mr. F. says—"1. Whatever the holy God has expressly sanctioned among any people can not be in itself a sin.

2. God did expressly sanction slavery among the Hebrews.

3. Therefore slavery can not be in itself a sin."

Mr. W. had said—"This grant was made to one people only, the Hebrews. It had respect to one people only, the Canaanites." Mr. Fuller's reply to this point is absolutely unanswerable, if Mr. Wayland's admission is correct. "Not so," says Mr. F., "strangers sojourning among the Hebrews, might be held in bondage as well as the heathen around; and Hebrews might, in your own words, 'be held in slavery for six years;' and they might, by their *consent*, (?) become slaves for life. Be it remembered, too, that, long before this, the patriarchs held slaves and not under any grant. 'Abimelech (?) took sheep, and oxen, and men servants, and maid servants, and gave them unto Abraham.' Gen. xx. 14. Pharaoh, too, enriched him with sheep, and oxen, and he-asses, and men servants, and maid servants." Then, after quoting an opinion of "M. Henry," the last writer ever to be quoted as *authority*, where any case of doubt exists, he introduces the syllogism I have already quoted.

There can be no reply to Mr. F., if only "Abraham and the patriarchs held slaves," and if God gave the Jews, by Moses, "special directions" to hold slaves, as Mr. W. had granted. The only possible way of escaping the difficulty (if after all there is any difficulty,) is to show that both writers are alike in error. The kind of servitude under the patriarchate has been examined, and we found all freemen and not slaves. The gifts of Abimelech and Pharaoh to Abraham, therefore, constitute no difficulty. I could receive the gift of all Mr. Fuller's numerous slaves, and of all the slaves in the United States, for the purpose of doing as Abraham did, viz: to carry them *out* of slavery into freedom. Neither Abimelech nor Pharaoh was a patriarch, but the one, "king of Gerar, and the other, of Egypt." The word patriarch is used only four times in the Bible, and then only in the New Testament. It is there applied only to Abraham and the twelve sons of Jacob, and once to David. Still, from what we are told of Isaac and Jacob, we infer that they held that station. David, though, indeed, a king, is once, by way of respect, not to designate his office, called, "*the patriarch David.*" Acts ii. 29.

But, I believe, Abimelech and Pharaoh are never regarded as patriarchs, for they held authority of an entirely different character. If, therefore, they were slaveholders and gave away slaves, these facts are neither proof nor presumptive evidence that the patriarch Abraham in accepting these gifts became a slaveholder; for, his former subjects being free, these would naturally fall into the same condition. None of the patriarchs are ever said to have given away servants, nor to have sold any, unless we except the case of Joseph.

The sons of Jacob in selling Joseph to the Ishmaelites, are, I think, usually and justly considered to have set an example for *Judas Iscariot*, rather than for Christians. This is the only instance among them of *selling* a man or any human be-

ing ; and no instance of such a transaction is recorded of Moses or of any of the Israelites, of his or any subsequent period ; neither is any permission so to do given by the covenant of God with Abraham, nor in the Levitical or Mosaic law, nor afterwards. But under this law, they might “ buy ” *servants* ; and they did, sometimes, like Isaac and Jacob, “ buy ” *wives*, but not *slaves*. To buy a servant is a very different matter from buying and *selling* men. Few, perhaps, would blame me for buying all the slaves of the South ; many Northern proslavery men might think me doing a good business as an abolitionist, if I bought them *into* liberty. So the mere buying of servants does not necessarily imply the act of enslaving them. But to “ buy men to sell again,” is a “ merchandize ” in “ the bodies and souls of men,” and this God abhors, (see Rev. xviii : 11, 12,) because it involves injustice or the wresting from men their rights, which sin may not be involved in merely *buying* men or women, and is not, where there is equal freedom on both parties in making the bargain, the payment, of course, being made *to the man sold*. So a man may sell himself and his wife and children together, without being guilty of injustice, as was the fact in the families of Jacob and his sons. But this a slave never does and never can do. Jesus bought us off from sin by his most precious blood ; but justice, truth, benevolence, all forbid that he should *sell us back* into sin again. So I may justly buy men off from some punishments threatened by government ; but I should not, therefore, have the right, at my option, to sell them again, though in some sense they would be mine,—they are my “ *monéy* ” i. e., an equivalent for my money. So I may justly buy a minor and pay his father for him, so far as he has a right to the labor or service of his son ; but, without a special agreement, I can not, by either the law of God or the statutes of any righteous human government, sell him to another. And then, I can not buy

him of his father to be mine after he has reached his majority, for the *father's* right to dispose of him ceases with the minority of the child. Whereas, if, as Mr. Fuller asserts, parental authority and slaveholding power are *one and the same thing*, or perfectly alike, the child belonging to the *father* in his minority, the father holds, under God, the right to hold or *sell* him after he is of age as he did before. If *any* man may innocently hold that son as a slave after he is twenty-one, the *father* has this right, before any other man, and may innocently hold his son as a slave "forever."

If the father by divine right does hold his son as his slave during his minority, then no other man can hold that son as *his* slave at the same time; and, therefore, the *colored fathers* at the South have this right in *advance* of their masters, and may forbid their masters to hold these sons as *their* slaves. They "cannot serve *two* masters." Or will Mr. F. relieve himself from this dilemma by pretending that the *slave* father has no *parental* right in his son, on account of a higher claim of the master? Then slavery inevitably interferes with and destroys the "domestic relations" which Mr. F. himself declares must always be held inviolate. He says to Mr. W.—"You affirm that the right of the master is irreconcilable with the right of the slave to the blessings of moral and intellectual cultivation, and the privileges of *domestic* society, which I deny. \* \* Nor does the absence of the contract or consent of the slave, nor the right of transfer (the right to buy and sell the slave) at all alter the nature and extent of the master's right, more than in the case of a hired servant. The case is analogous to that of parents and children. A father," (is this a slave father? I see not but that it must be,)—"a father" (*any* father,) "has the right to the services of his child during minority, without his contract or consent, and he may transfer that right, as in case of apprenticeship. \* \* This is the true light in

which christianity would have masters regard themselves. A right to the services of a man, without his contract or consent, does not justify a wrong done to his mind or soul, or *domestic relations*. Slavery may exist without interfering with any man's natural rights, except" (a trifling exception it would be in your own case, would it not, my friend Fuller?) "except personal freedom"—that is, the "urging one man to labor for another, *by a violent motive without his contract or consent.*" For "a father" (every father) has "this domestic," paternal "right," therefore, this right of every father may be violated, without any violation of (without "any wrong done to) his domestic relations."

How pliable, how convenient a thing is logic! Instead of being "the science for the discovery of truth," as some have supposed, it does its work most adroitly and most to the astonishment of observers, when error turns slaveholder and violates its proper right to discover truth by "urging" it "without its contract or consent, to labor for" him, and yet violates none of its proper ("domestic?") relations." And why is it worse to hold *Logic* as a slave than to hold "an intelligent, moral, social and fallen creature" in that condition?—especially, since this science, *Logic*, may be deprived of every one of its rights, and, as we have just seen, be subjected to the severest torture, without awakening in its iron bosom a single regret or drawing from its adamant eye a single tear; while this right to "transfer" "a social creature" is, at the best, liable in its exercise to create more or less of pain in the "transfer" away from wife, husband, child, parent, brother, sister—from all social endearments, to the company of strangers, to the hands and "irresponsible power" of such a being as, Mr. F. himself admits, ought never to be entrusted with it, because he is liable to "abuse" it.

Now then, did Jehovah, *could* He, the Holy One of Israel,

who, as a vigilant and benevolent, impartial *Father*, careth for and pitieth his children, commit to men this "irresponsible power" which a short-sighted mortal, like Mr. Fuller or Mr. Wayland or myself, is wise enough to see could never be safely committed to any man? *A priori*, universal humanity, universal nature cries out—"It is impossible!" The gods of the heathen are vanity and a lie—for "the gentiles sacrificed to devils under the name of *gods*, who were supposed to permit slavery among their devotees—the Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, and other heathen to whom *JEHOVAH*, the Bible's God, was "the unknown"—gods cruel, revengeful, unjust. Here the religious theory and the associated moral practice might harmonize: but God our father, whose nature is immutable perfection, whose law is only a transcript of those perfections, "holy, just and good," the friend of the poor and needy, who "abhorreth robbery for burnt offering," who requires the oppressor to let the oppressed go free, and do it *now*—our *God* could never invest one man with this "irresponsible power." Since Mr. F. says it *ought* never to be done, I may well say, *JEHOVAH never did it.*

Shall I now be told by Mr. F. that I am beyond my depth, when I pretend to determine what God would reveal, or "what the scriptures ought to teach?" He has himself undertaken to act on this principle, for he has said, as once before quoted, "A clear and conclusive declaration of Jehovah's will *would have been given*, if slavery be an awful sin." How does he know, better than I, "*what the scriptures ought to teach?*" Let him, also, be reminded that he has admitted all I ask, and has done in his "letters" all that I desire to do on this point. He had admitted "that in a dispute with an *infidel*, the purity of the Bible is an overwhelming argument." I am "in a dispute with an *infidel*;" I do not mean Mr. Fuller, though I am sure there are important declarations of the Bible he does

not treat with respect, but another, yet as talented a man as himself. I, therefore, need and must use "the *purity* of the Bible as an overwhelming argument."

Mr. Fuller seems to be aware that there are other instances analogous to this, for he talks warmly of certain "enthusiasts, (?) flaming and furious—hierophants chafing and rampant," to whose "principles the clear permission of God must yield." Mr. Fuller's "permission," strangely it may seem to him, seems to these men, call them "enthusiasts" or what you will, as not *de facto*, to be found in the Bible, and they, therefore, reject not yet the *Bible*, but Mr. Fuller's "clear permission;" and they very naturally and reasonably aver that, *if it can be shown*, as they do not believe it can, that the slaveholder's interpretation is sound, the Bible cannot be a revelation from God. Instead, therefore, of talking so much of the "fearful responsibility and solemn duty" of the slaveholder in the treatment of his slaves, he would much better fulfil the high commission of a minister of Jesus Christ, by acting in view of his tremendous "responsibility" for imputing to the scriptures such an *impurity* as the doctrine of "the right of urging men to labor for others without their contract or consent." The preaching or writing of this doctrine, is repelling many of the most intellectual men in the community from giving in their adherence to a religion represented by its *ministers* as so corrupt. And I solemnly believe that those who impute to Christianity the approval of slavery as an institution approved of God, are doing more to prejudice the thinking portion of mankind against the Bible, than all the avowed leaders of infidelity ever have done.

As a minister of Jesus Christ, therefore, I enter my most solemn protestation against this iniquity. I do it in the fear of Him at whose holy tribunal Mr. F. and myself are very soon to meet and give our respective accounts of our stew-



ardship. And I call on my brethren every where to unite with me in this protestation. But protestation is not the whole of my duty touching this most serious matter. I have begun a vindication of the Holy Scriptures from the foul imputation, and I must proceed, still imploring the aid of my divine Instructor. Never was a question of greater moment laid upon my mind or presented to the judgment and conscience of every citizen in the nation ; for not one is without his responsibility in relation to it. I rejoice that so many feel this responsibility and are beginning to discharge the duty it involves.

In examining the Law of Moses I shall need say nothing farther on the signification of the word servant ; yet I wish to keep the subject constantly in view, while considering the circumstances relating to that servitude which was authorized of God ; for it will be seen that these circumstances harmonize with and so confirm the views already expressed.

After the word servant, the chief reliance of the advocate of Slavery is upon the words "*buy*," "*possession*" and "*for ever*," all of which, he supposes, so qualify the word "*servant*" that nothing else can be made of it but slave. To him a Hebrew servant is, therefore, a bought slave as a possession for ever.

I will first dispose of the last words, "*for ever*," as these are supposed to qualify the other words. True, though Mr. F. talks loudly about *our* setting philology at defiance, he makes no attempt at a philological explanation of any of these words, assuming, with apparent confidence, that the use he makes of them is the correct use, probably taking it for granted that a *menacing tone* will secure a silent acquiescence. This is not unaccountable, since a slaveholder is in the habit of commanding and being servilely obeyed, not only by his slaves, but by some Northern men nominally free.

The words "*for ever*," like all other words, have both a

radical meaning and a circumstantial use. The same is the case in the Hebrew word LAGNALAM, for ever, as found in the two passages much relied upon in argument for perpetual slavery under the Mosaic law, viz: Exod. xxi: 6 and Lev. xxv: 46. GNALAM or ALAM, a long period. The length of this period is varied by the words in connection, or by the nature of the subject. The word itself determines nothing, therefore, in regard of the duration of the servitude, even if the words "for ever" were understood to qualify the whole phrase; but the most natural meaning, Exod. xxi: 6, is *always*, or this shall *always be the law*, viz: that ye may buy or obtain servants of (from among) the heathen; and Lev. xxv. 46, ever after, or during the next period to the following "jubilee," 49 years, or, perhaps, only during the next six years. In any way, it affects not our question, since the agreement or bargain entered into between the master and servant was voluntarily made, and, therefore, forbids the idea of slavery, viz: involuntary, coerced servitude for any duration.

If it be claimed that the words *for ever* mean eternally, whether applied to the period of a slave's service, or to the period of that law's authority, the claim will not suit the purpose of the claimant, unless either the relation of master and slave must continue through eternity, or the rule or law must exist for the same *very* long space, during which, I believe, no slaveholder ever yet either lived, or expected to hold his authority over the slave. If, then, the slaveholder will limit the period at all, as by the life of either the master or servant, so will I give it the limit of the general law, which expressly requires that "all the inhabitants of the land shall be free at the year of the *Jubilee*—so free as not to return to servitude again, unless they renew their agreement to do so.

But "they shall be your *possession*," is thought to give a right of slave ownership. Since, however, God declares *himself*

the "possession of his people," without being their *slave*, Ezek. xliv: 28, and since that becomes a man's rightful "possession" which he purchases, paying the rightful owner for it, "*without contract or consent*" never being any part of such a bargain and purchase, the word gives no support to the idea of coerced servitude.

But "of them shall ye buy bond-men and bond-maids," does certainly mean something, says the objector, and that must be slavery. Yes, this means something, but not necessarily slavery; for it may mean something else; and every thing we have yet seen and the whole tenor of the word of God require, in order to consistency, that it be so understood that God—the God of the entire Bible, may be seen to be the God of order—"For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace." It is the advocate of slavery, who sets the scriptures *at war with themselves*, by forcing upon portions of the Holy Word, a meaning which the inditing Spirit never intended. Yet Mr. Fuller is too much "a lawyer" not to be aware that, in interpreting a legal instrument, as a law or constitution, it is an established judicial rule, to give an "*innocent*" meaning to such words as may be made to express both an innocent and injurious one. If Mr. F. would have the most favorable construction put upon his *own* words, most favorable to his character as a just man,—above all, should he have been disposed to put such a construction upon the words of the Bible as leaves the character of God unimpeachable, he would not have been shut up to the necessity of ascribing to God the establishment of an institution of which he declares himself unwilling to be considered a "eulogist and abettor," "the existence of which," says he, "I *lament*, for the *commencement* of which I am not at all responsible." No: In the "*principle*" of slavery, (that is, as he explains it, the committing to such a being as "the Bible" represents man to be, "*irresponsible power*,")

Mr. Fuller sees too much danger. So, to escape the odium of doing such a deed, he presumes to throw the responsibility and the odium on God. What more could *Voltaire* have done? What more did he, when it was his avowed purpose to overthrow the Christian religion and make "the Nazarene" an object of universal contempt? I go, then, for the vindication of the *Scriptures* from holding such responsibility.

I wish, however, to say that I have no desire even to imply that the *intention* of Mr. Fuller is like that of *Voltaire*; nor his purpose like that of ex-Governor Hammond, of South Carolina, who says—"Right or wrong, we will support slavery." But his education, as he admits, has made his opinions what they are, and has brought his otherwise fine intellectual powers under subjection to sentiments which his moral feelings abhor. Still, I can not, like Mr. Wayland, acquit him of "guilt" in allowing himself to be so controlled, since the "ignorance" which acquits of guilt, does not belong to a man so gifted and Bible-taught as Mr. Fuller is. We must look for that ignorance which God winks at, in a land of much deeper darkness than even that which broods over South Carolinian white men. *Tenebrae, quae super terram similem Egypto, tam densae, ut palpari queant.* Nay, this darkness must be very much deeper, for *Egypt* was not held guiltless, and "the Lord will never hold" that mortal so, "who taketh his name in vain," by imputing to Him the approval of that which he, the man himself, justly "laments."

Need I say a word, therefore, for the purpose of demonstrating that the buying of men allowed the ancient people of God, was not "the reduction of a free people to slavery," which Mr. F. would (he declares) "oppose as firmly as any man." For such would have been the act of the Israelites, if they had bought of "the heathen" or of "the strangers" sojourning among themselves, "their children," to make them slaves.

“The children of those “*strangers*,” none will pretend, I think, were “persons taken in war” by their *fathers*.

“Lament its existence” as he will, Mr. F. may not yet be aware how powerful is the influence which slavery addresses to, and practically exerts over that sensitive principle of selfishness, which, when excited, more than once prompted even the pious David to commit deeds he afterwards lamented. Γνωθὶ σεαυτὸν (“*Gnothi seauton*,” know thyself) is a maxim yet but feebly obeyed, perhaps, by any of us. It is possible that Mr. F. found a less inflexible antagonist in the President of Brown University, whose patronage from the South is in a degree contingent on the avowed sentiments of its officers, than he would have found in the same man while a Pastor of the First Baptist Church in Boston. “The heart—who can know it?”

Clear as it is, however, theologically, that the *buying* was not into *slavery*, yet “philology” is challenged and must abide a trial. God employs “words” not only “pure” but intelligible; for “God is light,” and his “word is a lamp,” much as the nominally Christian world is divided into sects through differing views of the Bible. Wherever the fault lies, it is not in God or his word. His “word is very pure; therefore,” should *Christians* all alike love it all, though this is the principal occasion of “the carnal mind’s” dislike of it. My “infidel” controvertist at the North, to whom I have before alluded, may not like this last suggestion, but truth requires that I make it, and I sincerely pray that it may do *him* good, as well as Mr. Fuller. Light, purity and love are the three glories of the Bible, and, when it is correctly read by “an understanding heart,” these conspire to “change” that heart “into the same image.” So transformed, it “can do nothing against the truth” which it loves for its intrinsic excellence, and for the victory it has achieved for the man over sin, to

which he had formerly “yielded” himself a “servant” (not a “*slave*,” however, for then it would be “without contract or consent,”) but from which he is now made “free,” a word not always the antithesis of enslaved, but free from a painful and very unprofitable servitude freely entered—entered by contract or consent,—yet painful and unproductive of any real advantage. It is in relation to this servitude a prophet very sensibly interrogates—“Wherefore, do ye spend your labor for that which satisfieth not?”—and says—“Ye have *sold yourselves*, (not having been “urged by a *violent* motive to labor for another without their contract or consent”) “for nought.” The fact that they got nothing for the sale in this case, and that they labored for nothing satisfying, did not nullify “the contract” nor disprove their “consent,” and so did not make them slaves, but only voluntary, contracted “servants of sin.”

I am heartily thankful for Mr. Fuller’s definition of slavery, inasmuch as it is so graphic, and has the very soul of slavery in it, and can not be misunderstood, or varied, or “retrenched” even by himself, saving only the single word “right,” which, we have seen, was, by a remarkable figure of speech, put for wrong. So I may say, with Mr. W., that “it pleases me better than any I have ever seen,” though, perhaps, not for precisely the same reason. And I find this pleasure increasing as I proceed by its light in the examination of the scriptures, because, when set by the side of Bible words, such as *servant*, *laborer*, *buy*, &c., it *serves*, not by coercion either, but spontaneously, to evince very clearly at every step, that to make slavery adhere to those words, is an impossibility. The definition slides off like water from a smooth surface inverted, and carries away with it every taint of slavery which misinterpretation had imparted to these words.

The Truth, new-washed, shines brighter than before,—  
As diamonds sparkle on the sea-beat shore,  
Where long imbedded they withheld their light,  
Till dashing waves have washed them into sight.

I am no poet, but these "lines" express what none will question, and "I flatter myself," (for neither Mr. Fuller nor Mr. Wayland may be disposed to flatter me as they did each other,) that many passages have been incidentally and informally, but still sufficiently illustrated, while we have been approaching the word "buy," and we may be the better, more scripturally prepared for the examination of the scriptural use of this "difficult word," as some regard it.

The word used Levit. xxv. 44, 45 and Exod. xxi. 1, is KANAH, which Gibb's Gesenius defines, "1, to get, gain, acquire ; 2, to buy ; 3, particularly to redeem, ransom, e. g., from captivity ; 4, to obtain for a possession, to obtain ; 5, to own, possess ; 6, prepare, form, make."

I take the first meaning here given to be the general or etymological one ; as, on examining the various passages where the word is used and translated to *buy*, I find that the word *get* may be substituted in nearly, if not in every instance, for "*buy*," without changing the sense. Obtaining or getting for money or any article of property is to "*buy*," which latter English word implies what *get*, or *obtain* does not, as you may get, obtain, acquire, without buying, whether rightfully or wrongfully.

In the three passages named above, *get* or *obtain* suits the connection perfectly well :—as, If thou get, or obtain a *Hebrew* servant—of the heathen shall ye obtain—of the children of strangers that sojourn among you, of them shall ye obtain ; —so Isa. lv. 1—"come obtain, get wine and milk, without money and without price." To "*buy*" without money and without price, can not be done, but where articles are offered free, they may be *obtained* without money or price. Jer. xxii. 44, men shall obtain, or get, or acquire fields for money. Deut xxviii. 68, ye shall be sold, and no man shall get, take, you. I will not insist on substituting in Exod. and Levit.

another meaning given by Gesenius, viz. "to *redeem*," though might with much more propriety, than to admit that the *buying* there spoken of was *into* slavery. If, as some advocates of slavery have said, the servants to be obtained from among the heathen were "persons taken captive in war," then God might well give permission to his people to obtain them by purchase for "*servants*," which is all the word "bond-man" (EBED) can mean, as I have shown. But they might obtain servants of the children of strangers residing among them; and, as these children were not of that description of persons, *they* needed not to be redeemed, being already free. I, therefore, prefer the word obtain. And, when we come to see how the servants were to be treated under law, there being but "one," the same "law, for the home-born and the stranger,"—not home-born servant, but *person*, as the application is to all classes of the people,—we may be satisfied that to obtain is the better word, and much better harmonizes with that judicial rule, that the "innocent meaning" is always to be preferred in a doubtful case, as well as with the justice and benevolence of the Gospel.

The servant obtained for money might himself receive and possess and literally own the money, agreeing, "contracting, consenting" to labor for the obtainer on that account, for the period for which he "contracted," viz. to the next 7th or 50th year, having during that period the privileges of a free citizen, which, "without his contract or consent," he could not be. This accords better with what Mr. F. says of a slave's receiving compensation and consenting to be a servant, than with his definition of a slave:—indeed, it can not be a slave who "consents" and receives "compensation." Let him say *servant*, and all difficulty ceases. The servant obtained for money was, of course, to be "circumcised," and so naturalized and made partaker of all the privileges of other freemen or



Israelites. The hired servant and the stranger were not freemen, i. e., citizens, members of the congregation of Israel, till they, also, were ritually admitted by being "circumcised." "No stranger shall eat thereof (the Passover.) But every man's servant that is bought (obtained) for money, when thou hast circumcised him, *then* shall he eat thereof. A stranger and a *hired* servant shall *not* eat thereof. All *the congregation of Israel* shall keep it. And, when a stranger will keep the passover, let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it; and he shall be as one that is born in the land; for no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof. One law," &c. Exod. xii. So it appears that whoever was circumcised, was naturalized or made a freeman or citizen—*no slave*.

I shall not need say much of the word possession, as every one knows that, though it may be said that "possession is nine parts of the law," it is not necessarily ownership. Many possess what they do not own, and own what they do not possess.

All those slaveholders, therefore, who believe that Baptism is a substitute for circumcision and have their slaves baptized, do, in this act, admit those baptized ("circumcised") servants to citizenship, or make them freemen; whereas they must regard unbaptized "strangers and hired servants" as not being freemen. But this is not applicable to Mr. F. and those who believe with him about baptism. Still, let these reflect that, as the circumcised "bought" servant and the stranger were admitted to Israelitish citizenship or freedom, while the "uncircumcised person" was not a citizen or freeman, so under the Constitution of the United States, those strangers, "foreigners," who have not resided here a certain period and taken the oath of allegiance, are not "freemen" in the Constitutional sense of the term, and these may be the "all other per-

sons" referred to in the Constitution, who are to be reckoned in districting for the choice of representatives to Congress, unless we throw out of the Constitution what it contains touching the purpose "to establish justice," &c.

I am not disposed to go into the political bearings of this subject; yet, as Mr. F. treats slavery as he does, lest "the union" of the States be broken by other views of it, I may be "suffered thus far." I am more inclined to believe that the *Truth* will sooner and better "heal" what of severance has been occasioned by slavery, than that the continuance of the cause of this terrible evil will "touch" the severed ear "and heal it." Let justice be done—let slavery die—let the slavery-benighted millions be enlightened—let the wrongs heretofore inflicted on them be repented of and redressed—let there be in our land "one law for the home-born and for the stranger"—equal justice to all without "respect of persons," in agreement with the Mosaic law, and peace would return to our country. Then no occasion would exist for the North to complain of the injustice and cruelties of the South, and none for the South to "nullify" the Constitution by denying to Abolitionists, as well as slaves, the rights of citizens, as they now do. Then the Congress of the nation will cease to be a field of war, and the disgraceful scenes of blood, so often occurring in the Slave States among their own citizens, would no more exist. Then, too, the ecclesiastical dissensions which, for years past, have rent the Missionary and other Societies of general benevolence, would be forgotten.

On whom rests the responsibility of all these and the numerous other evils which exist because slavery exists? "It will not do" for Mr. Fuller to say that these evils would cease, if only the North were silent. The South are divided. The South are much the greater sufferers than the North, whether we regard either the slaves or the nominally free people, of all

complexions. For, in what other section of the land are to be found one-half so great a proportion of white paupers, of uneducated, degraded, morally corrupt and reckless and hopeless free people, to say nothing of the slaves? But who are the slaves? Are they thrust beyond the pale of humanity and human sympathy? No. Mr. F. feels for their woes and "laments" their condition, though, at times, he strives against himself, against his better judgment and nobler sentiments, to argue for an institution he condemns.

The slaves Mr. Fuller admits to be men, and many of them brethren in Christ;—and yet, so deep is the delusion which enwraps his perceptions that he seems not to see that they are not treated as either Christian Brethren, or rational and rightful inhabitants of the earth. If they are men, he knows that by the laws of slavery, which, it is far more evident, are necessary to the existence of slavery, than is the claim he makes for "the divine right" of "the principle" of slavery—he well knows that, by these laws, instead of being protected as were the Israelitish servants in the enjoyment of all the rights of men, they are divested of "*the right of personal liberty*,"—the right of self-protection and defense, the right of civil protection, by being denied the privilege of their oath, and trial by jury, and that they are exposed to many more "capital punishments" than other men, in direct contrariety to the obviously just gospel maxim that, where much is given, much shall be required; and in glaring violation of the gospel law that the ignorant shall be punished with few stripes, and the enlightened with many stripes, for the same offences; while the Israelitish *servants* were protected against maltreatment by sterner laws than were provided for the protection of other persons.

In order that the contrast may be more distinctly seen, I will call up some of the laws in the Levitical code, enacted

for the special protection of the servants living under it ; and, I sincerely hope the result will demonstrate to Mr. F., in agreement with the avowed desire of his heart, that God has *not* given " a revelation not only not forbidding but permitting as great a sin as can be conceived." The words here quoted were used in reply to Mr. Wayland's admissions that Abraham and other patriarchs held slaves, and that slavery existed in the New Testament Churches. That reply is truly noble in spirit and irresistible in argument. I would rather be the author of it, than of all that Mr. Wayland's letters contain against slavery, qualified as it is. But it may be more suitable to take a more extended notice of it, when I come to review the letters of Mr. W.

#### PROTECTION OF SERVANTS UNDER THE MOSAIC LAW.

Lev. xxiv. He that killeth *any* man shall surely be put to death. In case a *slave* is killed without permission of the master, the owner is by law empowered to obtain damages for the loss ; which law has no example in the law of Moses, but the murderer of a neighbor's servant is to be put to death, and there is the end of the matter. Yet it is provided that " he that killeth a beast shall make it good ; beast for beast ;" because beasts are property, as servants are not. " He that killeth a beast shall restore it, and he that killeth a *man*" (any man, whether a servant or not, of course,) " shall be put to death. Ye shall have one manner of law for the stranger as for one of your own country." " Breach for breach, eye for eye, tooth for tooth ; as he hath caused a blemish in a *man*, (any man,) so shall it be done to him again." By this law a " servant" is protected against a personal *blemish* by his master, whereas a slave, under the Roman Code, the American Code, and so far as we have any information, every other slave code, is liable to be " blemished," mutilated, destroyed, without protection. That I am not mistaken in considering

this law as intended for the protection of servants, is seen in Exod. xxi. 24, 27. "Eye for eye, stripe for stripe—and, if a man smite the eye of his servant or the eye of his maid, so that it perish, he shall let him *go free*" (SHALACH, dismiss, send away, the word "*free*" having no corresponding word in this place in the Hebrew) "for his eye's sake." The same of "a tooth." Here the servant has a peculiar, additional protection. If the master, having paid his money to obtain the services of a man or woman for the time remaining of the prescribed period to the next "jubilee," shall be guilty of spoiling the eye of his servant, he shall *not only* lose one of his own eyes, and the same, if it be "a tooth," but shall, in either case, *also*, dismiss the servant from his employment, and so lose the "money" he has paid him for his service. I say, paid him. That the money was paid *to the person bought*, and not to another person claiming to be his owner, appears in Levit. xxv. 51; and, since the advocate of slavery professes much reliance on that chapter, it is with the more pleasure I refer him to it. The law of redemption provides that a man might redeem himself, by paying for the *remainder* of his time. Observe particularly and carefully the language of the law, "If there be yet many years behind (or remaining in the period for which he "sold himself,") "*according unto them* he shall give again the price of his redemption, OUT OF THE MONEY HE WAS BOUGHT FOR." It will not avail Mr. Fuller to attempt an evasion of this decisive passage, under cover of a pretence that a *Hebrew* is here spoken of, because the *only* question in hand is, *who received the purchase money?* the person bought, or some other person?—and the Hebrew who was *sold*, was sold as *really* as a foreigner, and was sold as a servant (Mr. F. says "slave") as truly as the foreigner. The advocates of slavery, who assert "the divine right," on the strength of the Levitical law, seem never to have

dropped their eye on this passage, which the Holy Ghost has caused to be placed in that law, as though in anticipation of some (then far future) daring and "reckless" attempt to make this law subsidiary to the cause of slavery. Now I am willing to let the slaveholder have the word "*buy*," if he demands it, instead of *obtain* in the passage,—“of (from among) the heathen round about you, shall ye buy;” &c. Only let God tell him, as he does here, that, when he “buys” a man, he shall pay “the price” *to that man*, and he may “buy” as many men as will sell themselves, if he is able to give them their price, or “the price” they set on themselves. Then we shall have *two*, instead of only one, to make the bargain,—then, instead of having men made *slaves* by being “urged by a violent motive to labor for another *without* their contract or consent, *it is true*,” we shall have “servants” who become such by their own “contract” and “consent.” Indeed, we have such in New England and all the North, in every grade of society; and I am pleased that there are *some* such at the South. These, when they receive “wages” in advance, but choose at any time afterwards, during the period, to decline further service, will, if they are just men, act as the Levitical law requires—“pay again” (pay back) “the price” of the remaining period.

But, suppose this servant to have a wife and children, what shall be done with *them*, if he goes away? I answer: Only make due allowance for variations in the *form*, we have the same principle in use. In case a free citizen—a citizen of Massachusetts—should be disposed to abandon his wife and children, leaving a business by which he can support them, and should show himself willing to leave them unprovided for, justice and benevolence require that, instead of allowing these deserted dependants to suffer, the overseers of the poor, if they have not employment by which they can maintain them-

selves, shall interpose for their relief. Even, if he were disposed to compel his family to accompany him in a life of beggary, they ought to be snatched from his cruel hands and employed and provided for by the proper authorities. The analogy is strong. The Levitical servant is one in a good employment, having his wife and children with him, and having in his hand "the price" or wages of future labor, and living under a law which secures all of his rights—being under no necessity to change his residence or his employment, either for his own good or that of his family. He is, therefore, an unfaithful husband and father, if he will pay back the wages he has received in advance, and turn his back on his family, of whom God made him the natural guardian; for, observe, he is not driven away. But being a freeman, he may act for *himself* and take the consequences; yet he shall not be suffered to tyrannize over them. They remain in the care of a divinely constituted guardian whom God appoints in his stead. They shall belong (adhere) to that *guardian*. No: this is not the case of the man who prefers to pay back his wages—"price." He may go away and take his family with him—there is no prohibition here, for he may redeem himself, and, of course, his family being free may safely go with their head, if he is so careful and economical a husband and father as to have preserved his wages, so as to be able to "pay back the price of his redemption, *out of the money* he was bought for." But the case I have supposed belongs to another man. His time is out, but he is not obliged to go from the service of a man who for the time has paid and treated him well, agreeably to the Levitical Law's requirement of the master or employer, who, in that very relation, is master or head-man or controller of the business for which he pays wages. God would establish among his chosen people order and stability, as a good example to other people. God commands this man,

therefore, to remain—to renew his bargain with that faithful employer, and requires the employer to continue the faithful laborer in his employment on suitable terms, if he will remain. If the *master* should take the first step and propose that the servant leave, no right is given him to retain the “wife and children,” they must go with the father, for God will give no law which empowers one man to “put asunder what He has joined together” in holy marriage; for “the husband is sanctified (sacredly devoted) unto the wife and the wife to the husband, even though they both are unbelievers, otherwise the children would be unclean (illegitimate) but now (in the sacredness of the marriage union) they are holy (legitimate)—constituting a regular and well known continuous posterity. See *Albert Barnes’* Notes on 1 Cor. vii. 14. I thank my old classmate, Mr. B., for his enlightened views on this passage, which has been so perverted by many, that its proper instruction has been lost to multitudes, and, especially, in regard to the sacredness of marriage among all classes of people; for, while God makes no laws for slavery, he has made such laws of marriage as no men may break without sin. And I am glad to see Mr. Fuller *theoretically* right at this point. Yet, I marvel that he did not at once see that God preserved intact these holy laws of his in all cases under the Levitical code. For “God” always “hated putting away”—“putting asunder what he himself hath united.” “For the *hardness of their hearts,*” Moses divinely provided that, if any should presume on doing such a nefarious deed as to put away his wife, “he *should* give her a bill of divorcement,” and so acknowledge the sacredness of the union.

“But from the beginning” (according to the principle of the marriage institution,) “it was not *so*”—it never was right for a man to abandon his wife. That is, such abandonment never being approved of God, his servant Moses was directed



to require of the unfaithful husband to *give* her a bill of divorce—*not* to obtain one from the Legislature—“a bill,” not denying, but recognizing her right to his care and protection. So in the case under view, the unfaithful husband had no *right* to abandon his “wife and children;” but, if he would do it, they should adhere to the master as their divinely appointed guardian. Now observe the proof that, if he should leave them, he was not a loving husband and father; “but, if the servant shall say, I *love* my master, my wife, and my children,” he would, under the circumstances we have noticed, *remain* and renew his agreement to continue his labor and receive his wages. He would, therefore, consent to the slight ceremony of having his ear bored; slight, because attended with not a hundredth of the pain of circumcision. To talk of that ceremony as “a painful and bloody ceremony,” is really too ridiculous to be heard with sobriety. But the bargain is renewed and he goes on in the employment of his old master (“for ever” meaning, as Mr. F. will not deny, the full period) to “the Jubilee,” i. e., to “the fiftieth year.”

Josephus explains the words for ever as I do. The end of the forty-nine years was the end of “for ever,” as the words are used in relation to all these bargains.

This limitation, I may here observe, to prevent a misapprehension, does by no means affect the doctrine of the duration of those enjoyments or sufferings which follow death; because, only take the words to mean the entire duration in any case alluded to, and they necessarily embrace the entire extent of duration which follows death, so in this case, meaning through eternity.

The Hebrew, who had his ear bored, was as truly to be a servant “for ever” as one from among the heathen, or the children (descendants) of strangers, foreigners resident among the Hebrews; and, therefore, in every fiftieth year, *all* the

servants, "all the inhabitants of the land" necessarily including servants, were to be released from all obligation to labor for others, until they made new *contracts*. "The lands," whatever sales had taken place during the forty-nine years, were, in the fiftieth year, to revert to the families which originally possessed them, and with this reversion of the lands, the termination of *all* contracts with every species of servants was unavoidable. One employer has grown rich, and added land to land, and consequently increased the number of his laborers. Now those lands can be held by him no longer, and no permission is contained in the law for his disposal of any of his servants by sale. If they were slaves, he would be bound to retain and provide for them, but having no more than a few acres to cultivate, they would become an intolerable burthen upon him and would render him bankrupt speedily. To relieve this difficulty, Mr. Fuller will find it necessary to *suppose* without authority, (for the law gives not such an idea,) that the master did have the right of *selling* his servants, and so introduce the whole bundle of the abominations inseparable from the slave-trade, foreign and domestic, and make the Promised land a slave-trading region, and Jerusalem the great shambles for human "bodies and souls," separating ("to suit the purchasers") the families of the slaves, as is done and must be done wherever slaves are sold. So, under His own Law, His own institution of Marriage, which God established at "the beginning," and has always held so sacred and guarded with so much care, would by Himself be subverted. I believe, Mr. Fuller thinks not very favorably of interfering with "domestic relations" in this manner; but, if he will have the Levitical servitude in his argument for slavery, he must take the foreign and domestic traffic in slaves with it. But who ever read of the slave market in Jerusalem? *Judas* sold *his Master* there, I admit; but, I think, not in even this case

do we have an example of slave-trading, although the Lord Jesus, "the Branch," was a "servant" (EBED, *Doulos*.) He was sold as a Lamb for the slaughter, and not as a slave to be "urged by a violent motive to labor for another without his contract or consent." Jesus took, indeed, the form of a servant, but it was a voluntary act and would no more suit Mr. Fuller's definition of slavery, than his crucifixion would the unwilling execution of a *criminal*. "He gave himself for us." And, notwithstanding the voluntary submission of Jesus to the persecution and insults of those who betrayed, derided and crucified him, and the *legality* of the proceedings against him, for he was put to death by the government and not by a lawless mob, no one will dare pretend that his enemies were not murderers.

Because God saw fit to punish certain grossly idolatrous and every way immoral tribes for their sins, and made his ancient people, by special commission, the executioners of his righteous displeasure in putting some of them to death, and in making others to submit themselves (as the Gibeonites) to be *tributaries* to them, is it good logic to infer that unauthorized individuals may now put to death whom they will? or that the government of a state are guiltless in putting to death the innocent? or that either individuals or government have the right "to urge one man by a violent motive" (irrespective of crime) "to labor for another without his contract or consent?" And yet Mr. Fuller contends for this "right" to compel ("urge by a violent motive") one to labor for another against his will, i. e., "without his consent or contract." Governments hold not the right "to condemn the innocent." If they may doom any man to labor without his consent, it must be one who has broken some high law of the land; nay, they must see to it that he has broken some law of *God*. To punish a citizen for breaking a law of human government, which law is itself an act of rebellion against God,

is monstrous wickedness ; for every righteous human law is no more than a specification of some law of God, no possible case ever arising which justly requires that a human law be enacted, either in opposition to a divine law, or destitute of a foundation in the divine law. *Charles T. Torrey* was incarcerated according to law—the law of the sovereign State of Maryland : but who will dare look up to heaven and look his Master in the face, and pretend that he was *rightfully* punished ? This Maryland law is itself moral *treason*, rebellion against the supreme government of the world—against the great and only Potentate, the King of the kings and judges of the earth.

The law of God is one and unchangable. “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself,” is a law as lasting and unalterable as God himself. It was written *in the Mosaic law*—placed there in the midst of the numerous specific statutes of that Law, as the standard of their interpretation and the regulator of their application in every case ; and, as the voice of God, imperatively forbidding both *Jew* and *Gentile* so to interpret any rule or precept of the Divine Law as to make it *seem* lawful to hold a man as a *slave*.

The view we have taken of the perversions of scripture, in both its language, its history and its doctrines, necessary to the argument of Mr. Fuller or any other advocate or “apologist” for slavery, leads naturally to the inquiry whether he is the man to intimate that Abolitionists may be driven to the rejection of the Bible altogether, in order to sustain themselves ? In his first letter (to the Reflector) he goes somewhat beyond a mere intimation of such a result. It is just, therefore, that we have an opportunity for self-defence. He says :

“1. In affirming what you (the Abolitionists) do, ought it not to give a pious mind pause, that you are brought into

direct conflict with the Bible? The Old Testament did sanction slavery.

“2. A man who denies that some sort of slavery was allowed in the Old Testament and suffered by Jesus and his Apostles, will deny any thing, and only proves how much stronger a passion is than the clearest truth. Both Dr. Channing and Dr. Wayland, with all respectable commentators, yield this point. \* \* \* \* They (the Abolitionists) occupy a position hostile alike to us and to the word of God \* \* \* and it appears to me you must either abandon the Bible, or make it teach an expediency and ‘keeping back of the truth,’ which it abhors, or modify your views.”

In his third letter to Mr. Wayland, he thus summarily involves all Abolitionists in equal guilt. “Nor should good men among the Abolitionists complain, if, in rebuking the wicked and mischievous measures of the *party*, no exceptions are made; for it is these very men who lend influence to the Abolition Associations. \* \* All who belong to that *party* are responsible for the mischief it does’.

In the last quotation Mr. F. extends the limits of human responsibility considerably beyond the rule lately adopted by some who regard the doings of a corporation or “party” as “organic sins,” attaching no responsibility to the individuals composing the body; and, possibly, beyond the limits within which he would, on a little reflection, like to confine himself. Does he hold himself “responsible for the mischief” *his* “party”—made up of all the slaveholders in the world—“does?” I have thought he did not; but, since he assails the “good men” in a “party,” with this war-club of universal responsibility, *he* “should not complain, if, in rebuking the wicked and mischievous measures of the party” to which he belongs, I make a like use of his own weapon. *His* “party” is made up of all who go so far as to apologize for Slavery;

for he is, perhaps, the most important defender slavery can boast, being a slaveholder, a talented, and learned, and reputedly a pious man. Mr. Wayland speaks to his face in the highest terms, of his piety. To give, therefore, his own idea in his own words—"It is these very men (the good men) who lend influence to the" Slaveholding "Associations." Only take away from Slavery what of support "good men" give it, and the whole system would tumble to ruin in a day. Some of us have been thought very wrong in ascribing to the influence of the ministry and the churches so large a portion of the strength of "the Patriarchal institution." Mr. F. is right in the general principle that "good men" are the chief props of any evil practice to which they "lend influence;" and it may do him good to look about and see who are the associates for whose "measures" he stands responsible. Gov. Hammond, for example, is one of them, and those who have read *his* lucubrations can judge correctly of the nature of the responsibility which falls on Mr. F. by being of his "party." Again, I have before me a pamphlet entitled "*A Treatise on the Patriarchial System of Society, as it exists in some governments and colonies in America, and in the United States, under the name of Slavery, with its necessity and advantages. By an inhabitant of Florida. Fourth edition, with an Appendix. 1834.*" Who the writer is, I know not, but the title is imposing; and the date of this "fourth edition, 1834," suggests that the Southern press had been busy in advance of the "incendiary publications" and "wicked and mischievous measures of the North," to which the entire disturbances of the South are often attributed. This pamphlet had enjoyed so much public favor as to run through three editions in five years, and its origin was earlier than any Anti-Slavery publication belonging to the present movement; since its "second edition," the appendix informs us, was issued in

1829, but those were not commenced till 1830. The North are, therefore, not responsible for this work, but Mr. F. is, because it is one of "the measures of the party," of which he has been for seven years, at least, a leader "lending influence" to all on it. This old pamphlet, which was adapted to arouse the spirit of liberty to defend itself, is read by myself and others with much greater interest on Mr. Fuller's account. And what "measures" does this associate and forerunner of Mr. F. recommend?

He is decidedly opposed to "Colonization in Africa, to forward which," says he, "a general system of persecution against the free colored people has been legalized throughout the Southern States, which leaves them the alternative of submitting to a condition worse than slavery, or of leaving the country to which nativity has given them a natural right; in this dilemma, it is to be hoped that some way of escape will present itself." Remember that this "persecution" preceded our publications and "measures." He says that he is "a slave owner, and has a right to express his opinions, having lived by planting in Florida the last twenty-five years." He disavows "all other motives but that of increasing the value of his property." . . . "Pride and prejudice," he continues, "our present stumbling blocks in the management of our negroes, should give way to policy and the necessity of self-preservation, and induce us to remove as far as possible, whatever are the *obvious* causes of this dangerous spirit of revolt. Power may for a while triumph over weakness and misfortune. But as all nature (from the eternal principle of self) takes part with *weakness* against *power*, the reaction finally must be terrible and overwhelming. . . . Our laws to regulate slaves are *entirely founded on TERROR*." The writer seems equally kind with Mr. F., and would have the slaves very tenderly treated; and among other means of pleasing the slaves, he recom-

mends the following, viz: that the master have it in his power to emancipate, so that he may promise freedom to such a slave as may render him special service, as in saving his life "by rescuing him from assassins, or in saving the life and property of a whole community by informing against conspirators. Is there anything," he inquires with good sense and emphasis,— "*Is there anything worthy of acceptance that can be offered to a slave, but freedom?*" He then goes on to speak of the necessity of allowing the free colored people the right of giving testimony, and pleads that "their moral character is better than that of the whites in the same condition." "It would be worth the while" he adds, "to try the experiment of a small mixture of reward with the punishment—such as allowing them the free use of *Sunday*, as a *market day* and jubilee, which, I have observed, had a good effect in all foreign countries, also in Louisiana." There may be some doubt whether the "Patriarch" Abraham or Moses, tried this "experiment" with his "servants." But hear him. "The laws of the Southern States are *exclusively* constructed for the protection of *whites*, and vexatious tyranny over the persons and properties of every colored person."

This statement of our Floridian Patriarch will be duly borne in memory by Mr. Fuller and the world. It is truth not to be questioned; but we seldom meet with an "owner of slaves" honest enough to avow it. Scores of emancipated slaves shall yet thank him for the frank avowal, or, at any rate, have reason to rejoice in consequence of it.

He proceeds—"Policy and self preservation require, to render the system beneficial, that slaves must be kept under *wholesome and just* restraint, which must always create some degree of resistance, more or less, to Patriarchal authority; to counterbalance which, the interest and co-operation of the *free colored people* is absolutely necessary, when the white pop-



ulation is scanty." That is, "the free colored" must be treated kindly (bribed) that they may help keep down the slaves. Again—"a war of color, would in our situation, of all wars be the most dangerous, because we naturally and *unavoidably* (under our present policy) contain within us the materials of our own dissolution." This kind and politic writer at length goes on to ascribe "all the late insurrections of slaves (as for instance, at Barbadoes and Demerara,) to fanatical *preachers*, and to white missionaries from England. Vesey, who instigated the Charleston plot, was an exhorting brother." This is a hint to the planters to have little to do with religious people. And then,—“A favorite maxim with some of our *old* Southern politicians, to increase the security of slave property, has been to prohibit the increase of the *free* (colored) people: or, by some means or other, not yet divulged, to get rid of the evil altogether,” &c. To this he objects, and, afterwards, tells his own experience in managing slaves.

He says—"I never interfered with their connubial concerns, &c. I taught them nothing but what was useful. I encouraged as much as possible, dancing, merriment and dress, for which Saturday afternoon and *Sunday* morning were dedicated. I never allowed them to visit, for fear of bad example," &c. He then tells of a minister who afterwards came among them and taught them "it was sinful to dance, work their corn, or catch fish on a Sunday," &c. This, he says, *spoiled* them; and "when it" (religion) "renders men unhappy and discontented with their condition in life, it certainly should be rationally opposed."

So much for *one* of the Southern "Patriarchs." Mr. F., another of them, "should not complain, if in rebuking" some of the above "measures" as "wicked and mischievous," I make no "exception" in his favor, since he is one of "*the party*," and "it is these good men who lend influence" to the rest.

The account given by this writer, who seems as thoroughly versed in every thing pertaining to slavery as any one I have ever read, certainly does not perfectly accord with that of Mr. Fuller. In addition to the statement we have already noticed, he avers that "the policy generally pursued by our own slaveholding State governments, with regard to free colored people, and that pursued by foreign colonial and other slaveholding governments, are directly opposite." That is, while others have made it a point to bind the free colored people to themselves and their interests by kind treatment, Americans have made "*terror*" the basis of their slave government, and the same policy has been extended to the entire colored population. This writer condemns this policy, as most unwise, making this class the enemies of the whites, and keeping alive their sympathies towards the slaves. He urges, as we have seen, that an "experiment" be tried of mingling some little of kindness with the universal severity.

Now let us hear Mr. Fuller. "In reference to the laws of South Carolina, I am not called to express myself in this discussion." I pause to ask why? The reason could not arise from any peculiar strictness of his purpose to adhere to the one question in debate, for his readers have seldom, I apprehend, been invited to sit down to a much greater variety of dishes having no nearer relation to the principal meal than that they were eatables of some sort. But hear him farther. "Suffice it to say, that *most of them* were virtually repealed by *universal* practice." If those laws were good, they should be revived; but, if bad, the "universal" people might have given to the world a more decisive proof of their nullity by just directing the legislatures to wipe them from their statutes. "The law, for example, forbidding slaves to assemble without the presence of so many white persons, is a dead letter, whenever the meeting is for a religious purpose. I might make the same remark

of many other statutes. The most important law is that forbidding slaves being taught to read ; yet how many are taught! (as though many were !!!) And this act would, long since," (since 1834, the date of the last edition from Florida ?) " have been expunged, but for the infatuated intermeddling of fanaticism." p. 160. Here we have materials enough for a long chapter, but I will not trouble the reader with all I think about these statements. They strangely clash with those made by our Florida " Patriarch," that " *terror*," some twenty years ago, was the universal " policy ;" and with what I have learned from many others, and personally.

Rev. *Robert J. Breckenridge*, once a slaveholder in Kentucky, and afterwards a resident in Baltimore, raises the inquiry—" What is slavery ?" and answers it—" It is that condition enforced by the laws of one-half of the States of this confederacy, in which one portion of the community, called masters, is allowed such power" (Mr. F. admits that the master's " power is irresponsible"—" a despotism") " over another portion, called slaves, as, 1st. To deprive them of the *entire* earnings of their labor, except only so much as is necessary to continue labor itself, by continuing healthful existence, thus committing clear robbery." (See again Mr. Fuller's definition of slavery, which he says is "right," if you have forgotten it.) " 2d. To reduce them to the necessity of *universal concubinage*." Mr. F. says—"many of the laws are virtually repealed by universal practice." Is this a part of that " universal practice" It would seem that the law of God relating to marriage is one so " repealed," if Mr. B. is correct ; and who does not know that slavery annihilates marriage? Mr. F. " must not complain," if he be held responsible for the doings of his " party"—" To reduce them to the necessity of universal concubinage" (*adultery* ?) " by denying to them the rights of marriage, thus breaking up the dearest relations of life, and en-

couraging universal prostitution" (*adultery?*). "3d. To deprive them of the means and opportunities of moral and intellectual culture. 4th. To set up between parents and their children, an authority higher than the impulses of nature and the laws of God" (Mr. F. thinks the master's relation to the slave is *just like* that of the parent to the child)—"which breaks up the authority of the father over his own offspring, and at pleasure, separates the mother at a returnless distance from her child; thus abrogating the dearest laws of nature; thus outraging all decency and justice, and degrading and oppressing thousands upon thousands of beings created in the image of the Most High God. THIS IS SLAVERY, as it is daily exhibited in every Slave State."

Such is the testimony of a well known, talented and highly respected gentleman of the South; yet Mr. F. describes the slaves as "a contented and and cheerful peasantry." p. 136. Let those remember this who have been led to think of Mr. F. as a *reformer*, and not as one speaking favorably of "Slavery as it is." Perhaps, his readers derived the idea that he is opposed to slavery from his saying that "at the South this despotism is (if I may so speak) not absolute, but mitigated and limited." Truly, this looks very much like a disapproval of slavery, since he contends that "slavery is despotism"—that "despotism is *not* a sin," and that "slavery is not affected by any human enactments." "Slavery at the South" is then better than the thing he approves, for "it is *not absolute*, but mitigated and limited." And this "*limited* despotism" is the thing described by Mr. Breckenridge!

Set, also, the judgment of Cassius M. Clay, lately a slaveholder, over against the statement of Mr. Fuller. "Slavery" says Mr. Clay, "is our national sin, and must be destroyed, or we are lost. From a small cloud, not larger than a man's hand, it has overspread the whole heavens. *Three millions* of

our fellow men, all (if our religion be not a fable) children of the same Father, are held in *absolute* servitude and the most unqualified despotism." In his "Appeal," Dec. 6, 1845. So much in proof of slavery being innocent, and the "laws" being a dead letter—"repealed by universal practice"!

Now, will Mr. Fuller declare it as his serious opinion that even one-hundredth part of the 327,038 slaves in South Carolina are able to read a single chapter in the New Testament? This *low* proportion gives 3,280 readers among the slaves of that State. No: Mr. F. well knows that not one thousand are able to read a chapter intelligibly, which is only *one to three hundred*; and, as to writing, can *ten* be found? No. And then, for Mr. F. professes to assert their "intellectual rights," how many have been "*taught*" Arithmetic, Geography, History, Chemistry, Geometry, Natural and Intellectual to say nothing of Moral, Philosophy, &c.—which branches of education hang down their fruits for the poorest children of Mass. to pluck, as is evinced in the hundreds of cases of such children springing up, not only into the common walks of respectable society, but into seats of literature, as teachers of youth, Professors and Presidents of Colleges, or into seats of legislation in the State and National Government, or of judgment in our Courts, as well as of theology in the Pulpit. Say you this is not a fair comparison?—but that I ought to set the whites of the North against the whites of the South? Why? Mr. F. professes to respect "the rights of the slaves as of other citizens, all but the small item of liberty, in some of his remarks. I may therefore compare community with community. And then, would he show in South Carolina, the whites, or even the slaveholding whites, on a level with all of the citizens of New England in literary and scientific improvement? But, our concern is at present, with the colored people, or rather, with all compared with all. But do you decline the compari-

son, under the pretence that it is ridiculous to talk of slaves being taught Geography, Geometry, &c? Soberly, why?—Why is it more ridiculous to talk of poor blacks acquiring such knowledge than poor whites! The very thought of a distinguished citizen, a Judge, Governor, &c., having risen from the lowest rank in society, associates the pleasurable sentiment of respect amounting almost to veneration, if he be a white man. Why is the thought of a black man having his mind stored with useful knowledge and being elevated to some post of honor, ridiculous? I answer that this most mean and unworthy feeling is generated by Slavery, and this fact alone is sufficient to prove it a corrupt institution. You say that it would not suit the condition of a slave to have such intellectual furniture; and, as he can never hope to rise to any dignity, it would be useless to waste the expense upon him. Ah, “there’s the rub.” Slavery thrusts down its subject too low to admit of elevation, and then pleads that his condition forbids his elevation. Let the pretended lover of universal human improvement, who looks coolly on this matter, look long enough to discover in it the occasion of his shame. Has Mr. F. who so loudly boasts of teaching his own slaves, ever thoroughly educated one of them? Or does he not mean that he has taught them as much as is compatible with their condition as slaves, and not as men and women—to use the words of our Floridian Patriarch—“useful,” i. e., as slaves? Others have, occasionally, taught them too much for their condition, and have been obliged to advertise them as fugitives. Mr. Fuller may get wisdom by similar experience. I hope he may enjoy a large opportunity.

For the present, I leave Mr. Fuller to ruminate on the gross insults he has so freely, and with so much propriety and honor to himself, cast upon his Baptist brethren who assert the sinfulness of slaveholding, and on the responsibilities he has assumed

in belonging to the "party" which upholds the system of slavery, with all its abominations, and in confirming the entire party in the self-wrought belief that they are right in doing what they "will with their own;" since it is to him they look as to a safe expounder of the law, and from him they learn that God approves them in holding slaves, and in using all the means necessary to this end, whatever those means may be, whether corporeal inflictions, or intellectual darkness and degradation.

I have now to take notice of the serious charge (which, like most of the charges Mr. Fuller prefers against abolitionists, is slightly characterized by acerbity) that the "act, forbidding slaves being taught to read, would long since have been expunged, but for the infatuated intermeddling of fanaticism." In proof, he gives an item of his own experience :

"It was but a year or two since, at the request of the President of the State Agricultural Society, I wrote a letter, to be read before that body, on the religious instruction of our negroes; and, in that communication, I urged the abrogation of this law."

I thank him for that. It was his duty, and when a question of duty arises, Mr. F. abjures "expediency," or a regard for "consequences;" and, of course, this moral hero will not be numbered among men who "knew their duty, but who did it not." Let us see what he says about duty. "That sin must at once be abandoned," says Mr. F., "is a proposition which admits of no debate. *If slavery be a crime, the consequences of abolition should not be considered at all.*" In his introductory letter, speaking of Mr. Wayland's former treatment of slavery, calling it a sin and yet admitting that the gospel allows of its continuance, and "prescribes the duties suited to both parties (the masters and slaves) in their present condition," he exclaims—"The Lord Jesus and the apostles teaching expediency! . . . they quailed through fear of

consequences! And through fear of consequences, the Holy Spirit has given us a canon of Scriptures, containing minute directions as to the duties of master and slave without a word (?) as to emancipation! Suppose that our Missionaries should be detected thus winking at idolatry, and tampering with crime in heathen lands. . . . Nothing but this unyielding, uncompromising condemnation of every sin could content him (Paul); yet, as to 'the unutterable abomination of slavery,' he is a temporizing palterer. . . . Craven and faithless Herald! And, after this, with what face could he say, 'I have kept back nothing'—'I have not shunned to declare the whole counsel of God?'"

I do not call in question the propriety of this keen sarcasm of Mr. Fuller upon the go-betweenism, or as Mr. F. would call it, half-truthfulness, of "the would-be-called" abolitionists of the Wayland school; but how does Mr. F. himself practice? He shall answer for himself. "I urged the abrogation of this law. The President, however, a gentleman of age, experience and exalted humanity, desired permission to strike out that clause."

Did he yield? If so, would he not, to use his own words, be like that "temporizing palterer, Paul?" Now, then, for the "boldness of Peter and John." We shall have, at least, the example of one modern Apostle who will not "quail through fear of consequences." Yet ("Cæsar had a fever once, when he was in Spain; and, when the fit was on him," &c.) Mr. Fuller does say—"And, when I had considered his reasons, and seen the character of the incendiary publications with which the South had just before been deluged,—works evidently appealing to the worst passions of the slave" (what! the love of freedom the worst of passions? it, indeed, the slave were appealed to at all in any of them, which I seriously doubt,) "I was not surprised that the best and most benevo-



lent individuals should regard the provision as necessary, and wise, and even kind. I had, of course, to yield!"

I may not. "through fear of consequences," which Mr. F. has so well taught me by precept and —— to disregard, overlook two or three facts which will assuredly cast some light on some of the foregoing statements.

1. Seven years ago, this gentleman, as I have before said, wrote a reply to an "Address to the South," when he said—"I have again and again received pamphlets on the subject of slavery," &c. "Let the sums now expended in printing inflammatory libels," &c. "We have bestowed on this subject (slavery) the most serious and devout attention." In the "postscript" he says—"Just as I am sending this, here comes another favor! Address of the Rev. —— before the Female Anti-Slavery Society of Cincinnati." The writer of this address was W. H. Brisbane, a converted slaveholder, who, seven years ago, was sending his "inflammatory libels" into the South. But, at least three years after, Mr. Fuller wrote "urging the abrogation of said law." "When," says he, "I had considered his (the President's) reasons, . . . I had to yield."

This is that bold man, who would regard Paul as "a temporizing palterer—craven and faithless Herald!" if he were to have "kept back any thing, through fear of consequences." What but this same "fear" induced Mr. F. "to yield," so that he "kept back" what he had written, "urging the abrogation of the most important" (most injurious) "law—that forbidding slaves to be taught to read;" and this yielding to considerations showing the law to be "necessary," was at a time, when he would persuade us those oppressive laws were "virtually repealed by universal practice." How, if this law were "a dead letter," was its existence "necessary, wise and kind?"—and would Mr. Fuller's erasure of his remarks from

his letter to an "Agricultural Society" revive this "necessary" but "dead" law? It seems that the bold man "through fear" of the "consequences" which might result from saying a few words to only the ears of a company of slaveholders, not a slave being present to hear, "kept back" his honest opinions against "the most important" of the oppressive laws of the South. Well, then, may he deem it best, "of course, to yield," in case of any other, less important, law, and so go for every existing slave law, by "considerations" of an "expediency" which he professes to hold in utter, soul-loathing abhorrence. Yes: he must, to be consistent, go for the resurrection of every other "dead" law. Say not, I treat him disrespectfully. The water which falls on him, is poured from his own vessel, and is of his own procuring; if foul, I have not fouled it.

Here, if any where, we have an example to prove that, the "passion" for slavery "is stronger than the clearest truth;" for no truth is clearer to the mind of even Mr. F. than that the law against which he wrote in that letter, ought to be abrogated;—at any rate, he had had time enough to become acquainted with the "considerations;" or will he tell us of any which are not familiar to every slaveholder and to all of us—viz. that, if the slaves are "taught to read," they will be restless in their condition, and may know too much of "their rights" to remain in slavery? These are weighty "considerations" with every slaveholder; but Mr. F. knew them years before, and, also, the character of the Northern "publications" which had long before been often sent to him. I think it possible that the "considerations" which caused him "to yield," savored more of arguments (stripes, the penitentiary with Mr. Torrey, and others—tar and feathers, &c.) familiar to the "sons of thunder" in the South, when they wish to dissuade any one, even though it be a brother slaveholder, from saying aught against their "Patriarchal" rights,

lest abolitionists might use the fact, or lest, perchance, the tender-hearted brother follow the example of the "many" he has known "who have turned abolitionists and gone to the North."

On his own showing, Mr. F. is responsible for the continuance of this "most important law;" and, on the ground of his connection with all slaveholders, as a "party," agreeably with his own views of the responsibilities of the members of a "party" for "the wicked and mischievous measures of the party," he is responsible for all the slave laws enacted by his "party." And, on this latter ground, he must answer for every one of those "abuses" which he condemns—these "abuses" include the sufferings attendant upon the domestic traffic in slaves, arising from the separation of the dearest relatives—the cruelties experienced in the chained slave coffles, driven by merciless wretches invested with "irresponsible power," and employing the best of their ingenuity in devising new modes of annoying the poor victims of their cupidity. His responsibilities stop not short of all the privations, too numerous, and, many of them too shameful for words to describe—nay, they stop not short of every one of the horrors of the foreign slave trade: for the entire mountain weight of all these evils is thrown upon the slaves by "the party" to which he attaches himself, and among whom he stands up in support of slavery, and with whose vociferations he unites his voice against all who proclaim "Liberty to the captive."

We will now view Mr. Fuller in another light. He, all the way, contends for slavery, and against what he calls the abuses of slavery. We have just seen how he disposes of one of these abuses, that law against slaves being taught to read, yielding to the continuance, nay, the resuscitation and enforcement of this worst of abuses. But how does he deal with slavery itself?

I have before shown that he professes to lament its existence, and not to think its perpetuation proper, if possible. Nevertheless, he says God instituted it, and therefore, it is not a sin. He says, "the character of this (slavery) according to the eternal principles of morality, is not affected by any human enactments." "With these weapons, they did extirpate at once from among Christians the Roman system of slavery,—but slavery itself—softened and so entirely changed by Christianity, that the relation between the parties was one of justice and love—they not only did not attack, but permitted, both by their precepts and conduct." p. 214.

Bring into proximity with these pretensions of slavery being in agreement with Christianity, the following statements of Mr. Fuller.

1. "The character of slavery, according to the eternal principles of morality, is not affected by any human enactments.

2. "May not the most zealous abolitionist be satisfied with the concession that slavery, if not restrained by law, is despotism." Or, as he defines it in another instance, "irresponsible power," which he admits can not safely be, i. e., ought not to be entrusted to any man.

As Mr. F. would not be understood to advocate any thing which he regards as sinful, some may be surprised at the concession here made, supposing, very naturally, that no American can be found, who esteems despotism sinless, both politically and morally. But such men are mistaken. Here is one who actually does say—"Politically and ethically, I have proved that despotism itself is not necessarily a sin." p. 166. It must be a wonderful man who can prove every proposition to be true, and every action or practice to be righteous. "Even the power of the Roman master, though perfectly despotic, was not in itself a sin. . . . We (Christians at the South) believe that all just moral institutes are only an EXPANSION

of these golden maxims, 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye also unto them;' and 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.' The reader now sees how easy it is, after all, to prove despotism sinless;—only "expand the golden rule," and what sin will it not take in and make holy? Mr. F's quotation from the Bishop of London on another occasion applies well here; "what is this expansion? expansion with a vengeance!" But he must before have proved despotism sinless, or he would not thus place slavery and despotism among just moral statutes. Yes; his proof lies in the Greek word, *despotes*, this word signifying both a tyrant and any ruler or master. I shall consider this argument presently.

In regard to "the concession" that "slavery is despotism," I reply that it does satisfy an "abolitionist" not more "zealous" than myself, that Mr. F. has done right in making it, and that he has, by making it, completely subverted all his labored argument from the beginning to the end of his letters, by which he has done the best he could to sever "slavery itself" from its "abuses," and to make it sinless. For "the concession is that, "unrestrained by law, slavery is despotism." So, aside altogether from "its abuses," leave "slavery to "itself," and it "is despotism;" of course, "despotism" in the ordinary, and, as this word is always used in English, the bad sense. The Greeks used the word *despotes* in both a bad and a good sense, as Mr. F. has shown; but the English never do use it in a good sense, even when they apply it to the sovereign of a nation. They would no sooner submit to the government of "an absolute monarch," or despot, than would "the most zealous" republican. A despot could not keep the throne a day in England. This is certainly the sense of "the concession," or Mr. F. intended to act the Jesuit in making it, telling a truth in words, but meaning another thing, which craftiness Mr. F. would not thank me

for imputing to him. I take "the concession," therefore, to mean what it declares, that "slavery, unrestrained by law, is despotism," or unjust and tyrannical government. But how does this look in the light of that other declaration of his, that "slavery is not affected by any human enactments?"

The "human enactments" restraining it, do not affect it, then. It remains, despite of them all, just like "despotism" or "irresponsible power," the same bad thing still. The Hyæna "restrained" by his chains and his cage, is in "itself" the same ferocious beast as when ranging the wilderness and "frightening dull night" with his cries for blood. Chain and cage him, and name him "a coo-ing dove," and feed him with Southern "corn and sweet potatoes and watermelons," the beast is the same blood-thirsty beast still; or, in Mr. Fuller's own words—"is unaffected by any human enactments." No man could have done better than Mr. F. has done, to sustain the declaration made to me in a letter some ten years ago, by that talented gentleman and strong and perspicuous writer, George Keely, viz: "Slavery does not belong to that class of things which can be mended—to make it better, you must destroy it."

Let no man, hereafter, talk to us of mitigating, or modifying slavery; if you "affect" it at all by restraining" it, you must destroy it, or it, the principle, the nature, the root, the relation, stands up in all its own terrible hideousness and unsoftened savageness and cruel disregard of human rights. Feed it, not with the salads or conserves of kind treatment of the slaves, but with its own proper aliment, human "liberty--bondage--nothing more," and what more could you do to gratify and strengthen it? Do this, and then call it a "domestic—a Patriarchal—a Republican—a Christian, institution," or what you will, it remains "unaffected by any human" christenings as well as "enactments." Turn this "despotism"—this

“irresponsible power,” loose, i. e., allow it to exist—once allow that it is “right” for “one man to urge by a violent motive another man to labor for him,” not at all like the child, under parental, or the citizen under civil authority, laboring for themselves in laboring in conformity with the laws of righteous government, but “for him”—for his behoof and benefit—not owning or possessing any thing, or hoping ever to do so, but “for him” in every sense of the words, “without contract or consent”—once only allow this to be “the right of one man” over “another man,” and then go to your Legislature for “restraining enactments,” as you may be disposed, and Mr. Fuller tells you that it, “slavery, is not” to be “affected by any” such mockery of legislation. First of all, legislate to the “one man” “irresponsible power,” and then pretend to modify or curtail that power! Who does not see that a Legislature so acting stultifies itself? And, then, after all this, Mr. Fuller has the effrontery to tell us that the slave may be held as such even by “contract.” “Slavery is only bondage; and this may be voluntary and by contract.” He redoubles his effrontery when he adds—“and there may be no obligation whatever to labor, since a man who should sell himself to another, on condition that he be allowed to sleep out his life, would be, in all respects, a slave.”

So, then, where “one man is to urge another by a violent motive to labor for him, without the contract or consent” of the laborer, the latter is under no obligation whatever to labor, but “sells himself to sleep out his life.” Why did not our astute logician take “only” one step more, and say that the “condition” of voluntary sale of himself to be a slave “may be” that he shall be the master, the despot, the Patriarch, the “owner, to all intents and purposes whatsoever,” of the man who buys him? This might have “satisfied the most zealous abolitionist” with slavery. Then we might all, “by volun-

tary contract, become slaves." But, in that case, who would be the masters? Does not Mr. Fuller see that the word master would then mean slave, and slave mean what master now means? Therefore, no more would be done than to interchange the meaning of the two words, master and slave, unless it be to raise a somewhat new conflict with his own definition of slavery, which I will not waste time to mention.

Does not every one know that a name is a trifle, but that the thing now signified by this name, is every thing to the purpose in a controversy like this? Call Freedom Slavery, but leave me in the enjoyment of the privileges enjoyed under what is now called Freedom, and I will envy no man the name of being free, after that name is once made to denote that "condition" now called slavery. Suppose, then, that the word slavery is not to be found in the Bible, but that the "condition" we signify by it, is recognized there and is either approved or condemned, it is, in the highest sense, proper to say, either that slavery, the "condition," is approved or condemned by the Bible. How foolish it is, therefore, to deny that slavery—the "condition"—the thing itself—is condemned in the Bible, because the thing only is there condemned.

I stated at the beginning of this review, that Mr. Fuller's argument is reared on a fallacy; and I can not but think that the reader now clearly perceives in what that fallacy consists, viz: the placing the words "the right"—("slavery is the right," &c.) in such connection that it is impossible to make, even though urging with violent motives, the connected declarations harmonize or coalesce with these words. Only strike out these words and supply their place with the words, the wrong, the injustice done by one man in urging another to labor for him without his contract or consent, and every one of the remaining declarations contained in his definition of slavery, will take its place with ease, and the



result will be perfect consistency and harmony. Then it would read—"Slavery is the" injustice &c.—"To urge by a violent motive," in such a case is unjust—because the man so urged ought to labor for himself, and for those whom God has entrusted to his parental or guardian care, "because slavery holds and uses men, as mere means for the accomplishment of ends, of which ends their own interests are not a part—thus annihilating the sacred and eternal distinction between a person and a thing—a distinction "crowned" by the Creator of it "with glory and honor," "a little lower than the angels."

It is absurd to compare slavery with the relation of parent and child, because in the latter case, the child is presumed to be secured from oppression by the strong, almost omnipotent power of parental love ; whereas, the place of this principle is not presumed, but is clearly acknowledged by Mr. F. to be supplied by self-interest, "to labor for him," wielding what by no means belongs to any parent, "irresponsible power," the father rendering himself equally liable to punishment by God and man for injustice done to his son, or to his daughter, as for injury to other free persons. I might but will not, descend to certain specific acts of wrong, particularly in the case of a daughter. The inducements to injustice being strongly counteracted by parental love and every consideration of true interest and duty, he is accounted, every where, a monster in guilt, who can break over all these Heaven-constructed ramparts around the rights of his children, and do to them deeds of wrong and shame. Indeed, Mr. Fuller is undoubtedly aware, that it commonly requires of the slaveholder the most rigid exercise of his despotic, "irresponsible power," so far to counteract the impulses of the natural relationship of parents to children, as to "urge," constrain, compel the slave parent to forego the exercise of his rights towards the child, for its protection and general good. Here it is seen that the "irresponsible power" and

the parental power so conflict that it is impossible for them to "walk together;" and to coerce the parental into submission to the despotic, the entire power of the State and the Nation, it would seem, is necessary sufficiently to fortify the latter for the barbarous and unnatural task.

In the absence of such affection as that which naturally, from the very constitution of man; belongs to the parental relation, and conspires with every pure propensity and passion, to protect the child, this "irresponsible power" of the slaveholder (the more injurious, if conferred by the State or National Government, and infinitely worse, if it could be conferred by the Divine Government) stretches its iron hands, and grasps, not here and there some of the rights of its victims, but the man himself; and, "without his contract or consent," with him all his rights, from the right of owning his own wife and children, up through the long and precious series of rights, even to the last and highest of all—the right of worshiping God, according to the decisions of his own conscience, enlightened by the written word of God. This word the enslaved man is forbidden by state law to be taught to read; and, therefore, whatever other privileges he may be suffered, by the grace of his "despot," to enjoy, stern necessity excludes that light, without which the conscience can no more discern the right and the wrong, and find its way to heaven, than can the eye discern objects, and safely and successfully pursue a long, yet indispensable journey without light. Parental love not thus deals with its offspring; and yet this prohibitory law, the law forbidding the literary instruction of slaves, even Mr. F. thinks "necessary, wise and even kind," under the circumstances.

It is also, a great absurdity to compare the irresponsible power of the slaveholder with the power of any national government, except an absolute despotism; and I am yet to be informed that either American republicanism, to which Mr.

Fuller owes his allegiance as a citizen, or Bible truth, to which he owes his faith and obedience as a christian, regards a despotism as a rightful authority over any nation. "It is unsafe to trust any man, or any class of men, with irresponsible power," is the grand maxim which has beheaded thousands of despots, and would quickly make any man a head shorter, who should undertake to wield such power over these States, let him plead, as he might, the want of sufficient intelligence, or virtue, or beauty, among the people for self-government or republicanism. And that man who advocates the doctrine of despotism among the people of these States, is a foe to republicanism—an enemy of the country, and forfeits his right of citizenship in it; and consequently ought not to be allowed to go at large, disseminating such principles of "incendiarism" as, if they were to be adopted to any considerable extent, would invade the liberties of all the people, and tend to the utter subversion of the Freedom of this Republic.

Let that American who meditates such treason against justice and his country, relinquish so foul a design. "Procul, O procul, este profani."

Take not my word for the Anti-Republican, and Anti-Religious character of slavery; but let the word of a statesman, of no inconsiderable distinction among the great men of the South, (*"fuit Ilium"*) have some weight, even with the present generation. THOMAS JEFFERSON, though a slaveholder, expressed himself thus, in his published correspondence—"What an incomprehensible machine is man! who can endure toil, famine, stripes, imprisonment and death itself, in vindication of his own liberty; and the next moment be deaf to all those motives whose power supported him through his trial; and inflict on his fellow men a bondage, one hour of which is fraught with more misery than ages of that which he rose in rebellion to oppose. . . . When the measure of their tears

shall be full, when their groans shall have involved heaven itself in darkness—doubtless, a God of justice will awaken to their distress; and, by diffusing light and liberality among their oppressors, or, at length, by his exterminating thunder, manifest his attention to the things of this world, and that they are not left to the guidance of a blind fatality.”

If a man reputed a Deist could speak thus of slavery, a man calling himself a christian will do well to pause, when he finds himself degrading Christianity below the level of Deism, by imputing to it sentiments which Deism repudiates with horror. The Deist's “God of Nature” will awake to avenge the slave, if the Bible's God shall not—certainly, if the Bible's God gives countenance to such oppression. Then, there will be war in Heaven, in good earnest. But we are not shut up to a so blasphemous hypothesis. See Psalm 12. “For the oppression of the poor, for the sighing of the needy, now will I arise, saith Jehovah; I will set him in safety from him that puffeth at him.” Here we have a “thus saith the Lord,” Mr. Fuller. Who is the poor, the needy? who suffers oppression? whose sighs besiege Heaven, if the slave is not emphatically the man here described?—every slave, even your own, who has not the “right” to labor for himself, and thus provide for his own, but must be urged by a violent motive to labor for another, all his life, under the alleged right of that usurper of all his rights? See also, the word “spoiled” (robbed of every thing) in Jer. 22: “Deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor”

But what shall be said, when this slave power practically (louder than words) avows itself irresponsible to God, and indeed says it is God?—when Jehovah is robbed of his right of having his Revelation read by those whom He commands to read it? “Search the Scriptures,” is a command of God addressed to every man, every inhabitant of the land, and it can not be disobeyed, where known, without guilt attaching some

where. Am I to be answered here, that the slave does not know that this is God's will, because he can not read even so much of the Bible, and therefore he is innocent? Where now is the "temporizing palterer—the craven and faithless herald,"—who consents to, and so upholds those laws which incapacitate the poor benighted slave?—where the minister of Christ, who, when he had written his knowledge of this wrong, this high-handed interference with the rights of both God and man, afterwards "contracted" to put his light under a bushel, to please the President of an Agricultural Society of Slaveholders? Never was a fairer opportunity offered to any minister, for bearing a true and bold testimony against a great sin, than was afforded to Mr. Fuller on the occasion described by himself. This was the very matter—"the most important" of all the slave laws, demanding above all others, therefore, corresponding superlatively severe animadversion and unqualified condemnation. But the duty was "buried in a napkin," and there it lies rolled up for the judgment, stamped with the name of Richard Fuller. Would John the Baptist have let such a moment pass unimproved?—or do we not see his venerable head borne to his murderer, as a glorious proof of christian faithfulness in the forerunner of the Messiah, and a damning evidence against a licentious and murderous civil government in the person of Herod, the king? Would Paul thus leave an Agrippa, or a Felix unwarned? Or would Daniel thus bow down and worship an image, though the government set it up? Or would Moses thus leave his oppressed brethren in Egyptian darkness and oppression, (a less dense darkness and less cruel oppression, however, than American christians (?) inflict on their brethren in bonds) because, by so doing, he could have been held in repute and friendship by Pharaoh? Did those men of God obey the powers that be, when those powers required obedience to such laws as were not ordained of God,

but were hostile in principle and requirement to His laws, which are, like himself, in all cases, HOLY, JUST and GOOD? Certainly not, for the most obvious of reasons, that obedience to such laws of the civil power, is disobedience of the infinitely higher laws of the great and only Potentate, the King of the kings of the earth.

On this same rock of the priority and supremacy of the Divine government over the powers that be, though these little "powers are ordained of God" to execute righteousness and to punish vice,—on this same rock of the supreme authority of God over man, was it that our Revolutionary fathers planted their feet and the engine of rebellion against the British government. To that government they owed as sacred allegiance as we now owe to the government of this Republic; but, when they saw and felt that the powers that be were departing from the righteous purpose for which they had been ordained of God; those God-fearing men made their solemn appeal from the inferior to the supreme tribunal; and their appeal was sustained, and the judgment of the inferior was reversed.

But what is the doctrine now taught by Mr. Fuller? Not that resistance of tyrants is obedience to God, but that acquiescence in a tyrant's will, when that will requires the degradation of a portion of our fellow men in order to our own elevation or emolument, is both our "right" and duty. "I, of course, yielded," says this professed minister of Jesus Christ, when the President of the Agricultural Society advised me to erase what I had written against the most important of the abusive laws of Slavery, "the law forbidding the literary instruction of the colored people."

And this is the man who, in the pride of his piety, can not stoop to a controversy with Abolitionists! Verily, my brethren, in this we have but one thing to mourn for, and one thing

to be ashamed of. We may well mourn over a professed minister of Christ, so false to his sacred commission, and be ashamed that an American Baptist has done a deed which will deepen and prolong, I pray that it may not perpetuate, the already sufficiently odious infamy of this Republic, the father of whose free institutions (a celebrated and very venerable Professor in a Presbyterian Theological Seminary told his class some twenty-five years ago in my presence) was the Baptist ROGER WILLIAMS. This Baptist chose to suffer affliction among the people of God, rather than enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than all the treasures in *Salem*, Ms., or *Beaufort*, S. C. In view of the act of Mr. F. to which I allude, I sincerely pray—Lord, lay not this sin to his charge. But I can not conceive how Mr. W., after having read Mr. Fuller's own account of this deed of singular wickedness and shameful dereliction of duty, could regard the enactor of it with so much delight, as he evidently does in his rejoinder, telling him that "all he asked, if he understood his views, was that these be carried out in practice;" and that they "could unite in trying to make every other slaveholder just such a master as he is." But Mr. Wayland, and not I, stands responsible for that.

It is no new thing, however, let it be observed, that a professed minister of Christ should yield to the considerations suggested by some lordly despot, when he had thought this most important law wrong, unjust and cruel, and was therefore on the point of pleading for its abrogation. I doubt not, scores, before Mr. F., have been in the same predicament, from the year 1740, when South Carolina became convinced that it was "necessary, wise, and even kind" to restrain the christian people of that State from bestowing their labors on the education of the colored people, and especially the slaves, and for this kind purpose, enacted a law against this right of

the people to teach whom they would to write their thoughts and then to read the thoughts of others.

This law is against the rights of the White people. *They* are prohibited. They are forbidden to teach, though Mr. F. has preferred to use another form of speech, which seems to the hasty reader to imply that the law acts directly on the colored people. His words are,—“the law prohibiting the slaves being taught,” &c. This is the same thing, however, for the free whites are the teachers, and Mr. F. well knows that the penalty of fine and imprisonment, falls not on the slave, who is taught, but on the person who teaches. Mr. F. ought to have been explicit, and said so. The only subject of this law, responsible for breaking it, is the teacher, although the slave is the object against whose interests the barbarous enactment is designed to operate, in cutting him off from the privilege of being taught, and so entombing his intellect alive, and leaving him as a moral being, to grope his way through darkness to an unknown, unexpected and unprepared-for eternity. I doubt not, many a slaveholder’s conscience condemns, abhors this law, and to sustain the law the man is obliged to sin against his own conscience. This, I believe, is true of Mr. Fuller. And, yet, astounding fact, and undeniable proof of his guilt, he allows himself to be persuaded by the President of an Agricultural Society of Slaveholders, to place his own heel on the righteous verdict which his conscience, enlightened by the word of God, had moved his fingers to write against the odious law.

At this point I leave the reader to consider the gross absurdities of the position taken by Mr. F., that slave government, which necessarily involves the necessity of legislating ignorance upon the slave, is the same thing with that righteous government ordained of God, which the powers that be are by God required to execute for the protection of every subject, espe-



cially the *weak*, in the enjoyment of his rights—for the enlightenment of the ignorant, especially, the most benighted ; and for the elevation of the most degraded.

I am aware that tyrants have always contrived to degrade their subjects ; but I am not now dealing with a professedly worldly-wise politician, but with a man, who, claiming to be a worshiper of God, and a believer in the Christian religion, professes to desire the establishment of righteousness among men. This it is which fills me with alarm for the church, and for my country, and with shame for the man, while I read the anti-republican and anti-christian avowal, that the law of *slavish ignorance is "necessary, wise, and even kind."* How profound must be the ignorance of the man, who could even tolerate such a law, and be guiltless ; and how fearful the guilt of him, who, perceiving the turpitude of the law, could withdraw his condemnation of it, and leave it to live and grow stronger, and perpetrate on millions its work of death.

I will not stop now to inquire whether this law had its origin in a consciousness of the superior intellectual capacities of the black over the white man, and a consequent jealousy and fear lest the former, if allowed equal opportunities for improvement, might soon excel the latter. Whatever was its origin, the law exists, and Mr. F. is convinced that, though it is very wrong and shameful, it is "necessary, wise, and even kind."

I doubt not, many a slaveholder condemns, abhors the law more than Mr. F. does, and yet, like him, sustains it. Precisely the same considerations have operated to convince others of its necessity, if not of its kindness. For, though "modern abolitionism" dates back only to 1830, there had been, long before, friends of justice and the slave, who had written and spoken against the "sum of all villanies," as Mr. Wesley had truly called slavery. To him, I may, nay, I must add Mr. Whitefield, since Mr. F. has thought proper to claim him

as a witness on his side of the controversy, and Mr. Wayland makes no objection, I think. In a letter from Mr. Whitefield in Georgia, in "1739," "to the slaveholders of Maryland, Virginia, North and South Carolina; and Georgia," this celebrated man writes as follows :—

"As I lately passed through your provinces on my way hither, I was sensibly touched" (think of the date, 108 years ago,) "with a fellow feeling of the miseries of the poor negroes . . . . Sure I am, it is sinful to use them as bad, nay, worse than if they were brutes; whatever particular exceptions there may be, (as I would charitably hope there are some) I fear, the generality of you, that own negroes, are liable to such a charge; for your slaves, I believe, work as hard, if not harder than the horses whereon you ride. These, after they have done their work, are fed and taken proper care of; but many negroes, when wearied with labor in your plantations, have been obliged to grind their own corn, after their return home. Your dogs are caressed and fondled at your tables; but your slaves who are frequently styled dogs, or beasts, have not an equal privilege. They are scarcely permitted to pick up the crumbs which fall from their master's table. Not to mention what numbers have been given up to the inhuman usage of cruel task masters, who by their unrelenting scourges have 'ploughed their backs and made long their furrows,' and at length brought them to the grave! When passing along, I have viewed your plantations cleared and cultivated, many spacious houses built and the owners of them 'faring sumptuously every day,' my blood has frequently run cold within me, to consider how many of your slaves had neither convenient food to eat, nor proper raiment to put on, notwithstanding most of the comforts you enjoy, are solely owing to their indefatigable labors! The Scripture says, 'Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn. Does God care for oxen?' And will he not

care for negroes? Undoubtedly he will. 'Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl for the miseries that shall come upon you. Behold, the provision of the poor negroes, who have reaped down your fields, which is by you denied them, CRIETH; and the cries of them which have reaped, are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth'!!! . . . God is the same to-day as he was yesterday, and he will continue the same for ever. He does not reject the prayer of the poor and destitute, nor disregard the cry of the meanest negro. The blood of them spilt for these many years" (108 years more now) "in your respective provinces, will ascend up to heaven against you." See in Benezet's Appeal.

Read this, and then say whether Mr. Fuller has a witness in Whitefield whom he would like to call to the stand; and yet he has spoken *for* him, and said—"Whitefield could not believe slavery to be a sin." It would seem difficult for him so to believe, after what I have just quoted from him! Where is the *proof* sustaining the dishonor done to the memory of the pious dead? But Mr. F. must not be doubted, or you destroy his argument; for what, that has even the semblance of proof in it, can be found in all of his famous letters, ingenious as they are, if his bare, bold, confident, proud, disdainful, contemptuous asseverations are taken from them? And yet he has been applauded for his lovely spirit! He does, indeed, appeal to the scriptures for authority, and strives hard to make them testify for him, like the hard-pushed party on trial before a criminal court, who, without a single witness having spoken for him, cried out to the Judge with great apparent astonishment and vehemence, declaring that those who had testified were *his* witnesses after all; for he had summoned every one of them, and expected to pay their fees. This fact he hoped the Jury would not overlook in making up their righteous verdict. But how was his astonishment increased on hearing the Judge

charge the Jury, that, if they should find the prisoner guilty on the testimony of his own witnesses, it would not be their duty in bringing in their verdict, to commend him to mercy, since no possible doubt of his guilt could remain in such a case.

This is precisely the case of Mr. F. His averment is that Mr. Whitefield did not think slavery sinful; but Mr. Whitefield, when called upon the stand, testifies as we have heard him. He had before called as witnesses for slavery the Old and New Testaments, but they had both testified as the voice of God, that such testimony they could never give, so long as God hateth robbery, for Mr. Fuller avows that he commits robbery and means to commit it, by "urging other men to labor for him without their contract or consent."

True, he does not tell the court what the violent motive he uses, is, but that he reserves to his own election, implying, of course, that it is such as he may prefer, only it shall be understood to be, as in the case of that one most important of all violent motives—"the law prohibiting slaves being taught to read"—"necessary, wise and even kind to the slave"!!—although the slave may esteem it to be not quite so kind, since he must regard it as unkind, or it would not be to him a violent motive, but a persuasive one—moral suasion, for instance—and I do not forget, if Mr. Fuller does, that it is the slave alone who is to be moved by the "motive" and, therefore, he is necessarily the only person whose opinion of the motive is to be taken in the premises. What greater nonsense than to call any violent motive, either necessary, or wise, or kind to the subject of it, when he has done nothing to merit punishment, and, especially, when no man has from God any right to constrain his services. But Mr. F. would demur, and say that his crime is a refusal to labor for him without contract or consent.

Yet, Mr. F. is guilty of the same crime towards me. In

writing his letters to Mr. W., instead of laboring for me, he has labored against me, without my contract, to be sure ; but let me only, " nothing more," require him to labor for me, and write another series of letters as much in conformity with the eternal principles of justice and love, and of the word of God, as these are at war with those principles, and he would refuse to labor thus for me, probably ; though this he will, I hope, find to be necessary, wise, and even kind to himself yet to do. In such case of refusal, I might be obliged to urge him by a violent motive to labor for me. Would he then leap to the Bible to hunt up Patriarchal and even Divine authority to establish my right so to urge him ? " Ah, that alters the case." So it does, reader, but not the principle of action. Let the reader, or Mr. F. himself, (though I no more seek controversy with him, than he with the abolitionists) undertake to frame a single sentence showing that the principle is not the same in both cases, that between me and Mr. F., and that between Mr. F. and the slave, either I or he resorting to the violent motive scheme of having work done, and I venture to predict that he will find himself *semper et ubique* (always and every where) in framing that sentence. I will even help him to begin, as follows—

I am a white man, and the slave is —, what ? White Greeks, enslaved by thousands, for ages, though not descendants of Ham, for example. White, half-white, yellow children of the Southern gentlemen (Mr. F. must not complain, if no exceptions are made in his favor at this point; since, as we have seen, he lends his influence to the party doing such things) are in slavery by thousands to-day, and their number is fast overshadowing the pure African race, and some think, that, in a hundred years more, there will be left scarcely any traces of that race, and so American Slaveholders will then have risen to be masters of white slaves altogether. *Black* is

not the word then to finish out the sentence I left imperfect. Try again—I am a Christian and he, my victim, is a — what?

I thought of saying no more under this head; but its solemn importance constrains me to add a few words. What! a christian apply a violent motive to another christian to urge him to labor for him, without his contract or consent!!—and call this a christian act,—“only an expansion of the golden rule”? Heathenism forbid it! *Tantaene animis coelestibus irae!* (can such madness dwell in heavenly minds)—exclaims a heathen poet, in reference to less horrible things than this. But listen now, ye who truly love and fear the great and only Potentate in the christian church; for Mr. F. demands a “thus saith the Lord,” before he will yield in this case, though he “yielded, of course, to the considerations of the President of an Agricultural Society,” in favor of the most important and cruel and shameful of slave laws, according to his own admission.

He shall now have “the full amount of his bond”—demand—but, let him beware, how by turning his knife to cut “the pound of flesh nearest the heart, he spill not one drop of blood”—that he deny not that these precious words of the Son of God, are a thus saith the Lord against his claim of a right such as he describes as belonging to him as a slaveholder. See Matt. xx.

“But JESUS called them (the disciples) unto him and said—Ye know that the princes (*hoi archontes*) of the Gentiles exercise dominion (*katakuriuousi*) over them, (their subjects) and they that are great (*hoi megaloi*) exercise authority (*katexousiazousi*) upon them. BUT IT SHALL NOT BE SO AMONG YOU: but whosoever will be great (*me gas*) among you, let him be your minister (*diakonos* deacon). And whosoever will be chief (*protos*) among you, let him be your servant (*doulos*). Even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto (*diakonethenai*) but to minister (*diakonesai*) and to give his life a ransom for many.”

This is an express prohibition of all slavery. Will Mr. F. or any other man deny or doubt it? The Son of Man came to ransom, not enslave, and to instruct and command his disciples, and through them the world, that it shall not be the practice of christian men to act on the principle of the heathen, that "might makes right"—the *lex talionis*—urging others by violent motives to labor for them, without contract or consent. "It shall not be so among you"! Both by precept and example, he gives and enforces this prohibition of action on the principle of despotism, even though mitigated and limited. Who, except the Roman Catholics, the Greek Church, and such other Hierarchical establishments, has ever dared to find in the instructions of Him who came to serve, the establishment of any despotism in his Church? or a right conferred on any disciple of His (Mr. F. professes to be one) to lord it over God's heritage? To speak with strictest propriety, it suits far better the "doctrines of devils," spoken of by Paul to Timothy. Baptists, of all christians, ought to take heed and repel such a doctrine, or no longer make any pretensions of being peculiar friends of Liberty, or even disciples of the meek and lowly Son of God, following him afar off. "Lord, have we not taught in thy name?" "I never knew you; Depart" &c. Mr. F. seems proud of the number of Christians among his slaves!

Again, suppose I am a freeman, and he is a —, what? Why, a slave, of course, is the reply. Not too fast—it is an equally free person who is to be made a slave, about whom I am inquiring. Who is that? Some person who is unwilling to be a slave or no violent motive would be necessary, wise or kind, and, though Mr. F. and the laws of man may call him so, he asserts his liberty and gives the lie to both, and now, therefore, is the time and here the occasion to bring Mr. Fuller's definition to bear on the case. It will not be pre-

tended, Mr. Fuller's definition does not pretend, that the person contracts or consents to be that which he would not be, if he should contract—a slave. No. He is one who needs to be—it is “necessary, wise and kind” that he be—“urged by a violent motive, without his contract or consent, to labor for another.” The person, of course, refuses so to labor. Surely, even Mr. Fuller, who thinks much of the power of his own language, will not pretend that such puissance is lodged in the definition itself as to be the identical violent motive called for to coerce the required labor. So long as the person refuses, and no violent motive compels the labor, he is not Mr. Fuller's or any man's slave. Having tried three times and failed, I will surrender the task of framing the required sentence to others.

#### MR. WAYLAND'S CONDUCT OF THE CORRESPONDENCE.

In my preceding remarks, I have confined myself chiefly to Mr. Fuller. Many things have been passed over without comment, which are objectionable; but it has been and still is my purpose to take notice of the more important positions and arguments—those which more than others are likely to leave an injurious impression on the mind of the reader.

As an honest man, I am under the same obligation to expose any false positions and untenable arguments taken and used on the part of an avowed opponent of slaveholding as on the other part. Viewing the subject as I do, it always gives me pleasure to have any portion of truth relating to slavery, exhibited or admitted by any man, any where.

If Mr. Fuller has, in any case, done this, it is an occasion of gladness. I oppose not a sentiment because it is held or expressed by Mr. F.; neither is any argument less deserving of respect because it is used by him. The same is true in relation to Mr. Wayland. With both of them I am concerned



as reasoners, not as men or as christians, in this review. If both of the writers were infidels, and had written precisely as these men do, I ought to treat the *reasoning* contained in their letters, just as I am bound to treat it now.

Therefore, whatever respect or disrespect I may have for their personal character, this may be allowed to have no measure of influence with me in examining their words, or deciding for or against the merit of their argument ; for, touching the soundness or unsoundness of their reasoning, it would be as proper to determine on the essential points in a philosophical or mathematical argument by the reputation of the author of it, for talent or scholarship, than which there is no greater absurdity, as to believe because others believe in the present case. The professor who should teach his class to believe any mathematical or philosophical proposition, on the ground that Euclid or Sir Isaac Newton believed it, or that it had been believed by many mathematicians or philosophers of all ages, would be laughed at ; and, if he could show no better reason for his own belief of the proposition, he would be denied a standing among men of science. Believe the forty-seventh proposition of Euclid, because Euclid believed it ? Believe that the earth revolves around its centre daily, and moves round the sun annually, because Copernicus and Galileo and Kepler believed so ? Believe in the correctness of any theory of mental philosophy, because either Bacon, or Locke, or Stewart, or Read believed it ? Or even believe in the Christian religion, because Paul believed it to be from God ? All such faith, it is every where admitted by truly enlightened men, is utterly visionary.

It is too obvious to require illustration that, in case the name of Euclid had been lost, and only his demonstrations had come down to us, we should have the same confidence in the truth of these demonstrations as we have now ; and so of the

true system of astronomy and of every other science, that science rests exclusively on the facts and deductions from facts with which we are furnished. Even sound religious faith depends infinitely more on the internal evidence of the truth of the Christian religion, than on the opinions of any or all who have believed it.

It will not do, therefore, to admit the correctness of a position assumed by either Mr. Fuller or Mr. Wayland, without good and substantial proof. On the contrary, place the decision of any of the questions discussed by them on the personal qualities of the men, their ability, honesty, kindness or other supposed quality, and what will be the result, but that the South will take Mr. F.'s views, and the North the views of Mr. W., and so, whatever of disagreement exists between them, will be established and perpetuated. And if Mr. F. has commended more or less of error to his fellow slaveholders, and, if Mr. W. has commended any measure of error to the people of the North, so much of error will become incorporated into the opinions of the American people. The errors of Mr. F. will not be confined to the South, but will flow over the Northern mind, and the errors of Mr. W. will, in like manner, reach the slaveholders of the South. Posterity also, will suffer on account of them.

It becomes every person, then, to bring every one of the opinions of both these men to the test of a fair and thorough examination. If they shall be found to be true, adopt them on their own merits; but, if found false, reject them for the same reason. The slavery-favoring positions of Mr. F., have as I think, been shown to be untenable; and, I think, also, that certain admissions made by Mr. W. will appear, on examination, to be as unwarrantable as those positions of Mr. F. It belongs to the reader, however, to form his own independent judgment on all these things.

Mr. Wayland has made several admissions which I esteem very important, and indeed, so important, as, if true, to leave the cause essentially in the hands of the avowed advocate of Slavery. To these I now invite the attention of the reader.

If Mr. Wayland had never occupied any higher rank as a scholar, a gentleman, and a minister, than that class of men who are commonly expected to take on trust, without examination, whatever has been put in circulation so as to become report, or is adapted (*ad captandum vulgus*) to gratify the pruriency of the curious, or the less worthy taste of the lovers of calumny, it might not have been so surprising to see him, as a Northern man, seize the favoring opportunity presented by the assault of a Southern man, of some distinction, upon Northern Abolitionists without discrimination, to acquire some notoriety and to secure that species of applause which is cheaply purchased by uniting with calumniators against those whom, from being his immediate neighbors, it would seem most natural for him to favor and defend.

To berate one's relatives, is often regarded as indicative of a singular frankness and independence and high-minded spirit; and the same is true, when the objects of assault are so circumstanced, as to belong to the neighborhood, or party, or society, or church with him who seconds and sustains the assault made by a stranger, or one of an opposing party, or society, or church.

But who would have been willing to believe such conduct possible in the case of "the Author of the Moral Science"? I could not; and it is with the most sincere regret, that, in justice to a large and every way respectable class of Northern Baptists, I am constrained to lay before the community a statement of the facts in the case. I shall make it with the strictest regard to truth. Exaggeration, if ever called for, to give pretext for complaint, or to make an ordinary cause look

peculiar and glaring, is not needed on the present occasion. I resolve to make no farther comments upon the facts than will be necessary to bring them together, and to show their related and associated significancy and application.

I will here premise a few thoughts appropriate and necessary to be borne in memory, when the facts alluded to shall be brought under examination.

The persons to whom Mr. Wayland's remarks, I shall notice, have any proper application, are Baptists and no other.

This appears from the whole tenor of the correspondence, on both parts. Both writers are Baptists. The introductory letter by Mr. Fuller was addressed to the Editor of a Baptist paper. In that letter only two writers on the subject of slavery are named, Mr. Channing and Mr. Wayland. Mr. Channing was dead, and Mr. Wayland was ready to commence his reply to that letter the very week the letter was published. "I have read with great interest your letter on Domestic Slavery in the C. R., the present week." In view of this fact, I appeal to both writers, whether there was not a previous agreement between Mr. F. and Mr. W., and the Editor, also, that Mr. F. and Mr. W., as Baptist men, would hold the correspondence as it was held?—and whether it was not occasioned by the discussions which had been, for several years, carried on among Baptists? The letter of Mr. Fuller to the Editor of the C. R., begins with—"I comply at once, and in as few words as possible, with your request" &c., which harmonizes with the agreement of which I speak. He addresses this Baptist Editor. So early as the tenth line, he introduces the "discussions in the Triennial Convention" at Philadelphia, and says that "the abolition doctrine, that slavery is itself a sin," &c., "was reiterated in every variety of phrase," &c. He says, also,—“A correspondent in your last number holds up,” &c. After making some remarks on that article, he evidently addresses Baptists, when he says—"In affirming what you do," &c. He closes his letter thus,—Abolitionists are so

bad that neither the Editor, "nor any body at the North, who loves Christ and the gospel better than self, and strife, and fanatical intolerance, will long be able to harmonize" with them: Mr. Wayland then takes up the thread where Mr. Fuller left it, and speaks of "our late Missionary meeting in Philadelphia," &c. Mr. Fuller had formerly written, in reply to the Baptist Address to the South. From all these considerations, and from all the subsequent facts, down to this time, it is obvious that the correspondence was strictly Baptist. If, therefore, there had been, among others, great improprieties in their treatment of the subject of slavery, the denunciatory remarks of both Mr. F. and Mr. W., had special, if not exclusive relation to Baptists. If I were to admit that some others had used unnecessarily offensive language, I may deny that such language has ever been employed by Baptists, unless the contrary can be proved. From Mr. Fuller, heavy censures might be expected upon those of us who had exposed the sinfulness of slavery; but was it reasonable to expect this from Mr. Wayland, a Northern man, who knew or ought to have informed himself of the facts?

I may safely put it to Mr. W., and ask, in case he had read in Baptist papers—in our addresses to the South and to the North—or heard in our private conversation, or in our public lectures or addresses—any such very objectionable language, why he did not carefully record some of it, instead of dealing in undefined and vague, but yet sweeping and unmitigated condemnation of Baptist Abolitionists?

Suppose that, in this Review, I were to have adopted the example he has set me, and poured out unmeasured censures upon both him and Mr. F., without once giving the reader a single statement either of them has made: would Mr. W. regard me as acting an honorable and christian part? We have always desired and often urged that our opponents would quote what we have said. But no,—a "dignified silence" has

generally been maintained, in regard to our actual positions and arguments, while general, undefined censure has been heaped upon ourselves, without even an attempt at extenuation, in the hearing of slaveholders themselves.

Mr. Wayland has not once, in all of his letters under view, uttered a kind or apologetic sentiment in our behalf; but, on the contrary, has added his words of condemnation to those of his slaveholding and slavery-advocating correspondent, singing bass to Mr. Fuller's alto. I am bold to say that, if we had been chargeable with having dealt in the most "coarse and lacerating invective," ever employed against the sin of slaveholding,—even then, he owed it to truth and humanity, to righteousness and the explicit declaration of the judgment of God, to tell Mr. Fuller and the world, that our impropriety was incomparably less sinful and dishonorable than the everyday action of the slaveholder, and, especially, such a slaveholder as his correspondent, who had told him, before Mr. W. penned his last letter, that he thought the law prohibiting under heavy penalties any persons from giving slaves literary instruction, even to the reading of the sacred scriptures, was "necessary, wise and even kind." Mr. F. had told him this, and yet not a word of rebuke did he utter in reply; but told the man (who thus interposed himself between the poor insulted slave and his bleeding Redeemer, to prevent his attaining sufficient literature to "search the scriptures," and thus obey the express injunction of mercy,) how good he was.

But Abolition Baptists, in their Newspapers, in their public addresses, in their direct communications to their "Southern brethren," as they were for years wont to call them, were not chargeable with any such offense as is alleged by Mr. F., and repeated by Mr. Wayland. It is a relief to believe, as we do, that the course pursued by the two parties, will be reviewed by historians who will write with impartial minds. I feel no so-

licitude here. But it is my purpose to disabuse the present generation of uncandid and unjust imputations to those, in the Baptist denomination in particular, who have been and still are sincerely and arduously laboring to remove from the Church of Jesus Christ, the deep disgrace and scarlet guilt of sustaining the system of American slavery.

Mr. Wayland himself expressly declares that whoever should reduce him and his family to slavery, would do to him the greatest possible wrong. With what show of consistency did he, then, take to his warmest and most fraternal embrace the man who was living in the perpetual practise of so dealing with some sixty of his fellow beings?

Not thus did the Savior regard and treat those who injured one of the least of his people. He assured the world that He accounted every such act of unkindness as done to himself. If therefore, to hold Him as a slave, "would be that greatest possible wrong," He would look upon the deed done to another with equal indignation.

I now invite attention, not to any censorious remarks of my own, but to the very language employed by Mr. Wayland towards his Northern brethren, in order to understand the full meaning of which, the language of Mr. F., which he endorses, must first be brought into view. I will quote with the utmost accuracy.

In his introductory letter, Mr. Fuller writes as follows:—  
"You" (Baptist Abolitionists) "say slavery is itself a sin; it is therefore, always a sin; a sin under any circumstances; a crime which must involve the criminal in perdition unless he repents; and should be abandoned at once, and without reference to consequences. This is the abolition doctrine; and at Philadelphia it was re-iterated in every variety of phrase; and when even moderate men, and men seemingly very kind and calm in private, mounted the rostrum and felt the oratorical

affilatus, we invariably heard, not arguments, but denunciations of this sort ; we were sure to have eternal changes rung on the moral evil of slavery, the sin of slavery, the abominable guilt of slavery,—to be told that the ineffable horrors of slavery did not admit of discussion, and to be seriously asked what article of the decalogue slavery does not violate? . . . If, however, slavery be a sin, surely it is the immediate duty of masters to abolish it, whatever be the result—this you urge, and this I grant. . . . In affirming what you do, ought it not to give a pious mind pause, that you are brought into direct conflict with the Bible? The Old Testament did sanction slavery. . . . and in the Gospels and Epistles, the Institution is, to say the least, tolerated. . . . How are you to escape the charge of impiety? . . . A man who will deny this (that some sort of slavery was allowed in the Old Testament, and suffered by Jesus and his apostles,) will deny any thing. . . . The abolitionists however, are not among those with whom we can thus” (in the discussion of the subject,) “associate. They occupy a position hostile alike to us, and to the word of God, and to every principle of charity. . . . Examine the antislavery publications” (Baptist publications of course, or the charge is utterly impertinent)—“denude them of bold assertion and unmeasured invective against the accessories of slavery, and what is left? . . . What, then, are we to think of those who revile us as pirates and thieves, and fulminate anathemas and excommunications against every christian at the South, no matter what his conduct or character, simply because he will not submit to the arrogant behests of mortals who at best are, like himself, loaded with imperfections; and because he esteems the Bible a safer directory than the dogmas of men, most of whom are every day proving themselves destitute of the sound mind and charity of the gospel—of people who are essentially monomaniacs.



with whom in fine, whatever your course may be as to us, neither you" (the said Editor) "nor any body at the North who loves Christ and the gospel better than self and strife, and fanatical intolerance, will long be able to harmonize." It was to this that Mr. Wayland replied, in his first letter, as follows :

"My dear Brother—I have read with great interest your letter. . . . I fully believe that you, equally with myself, desire to arrive at the truth on this question" (of slavery). "I unite with you. . . . in the opinion that the tone of the abolitionists at the North has been frequently, I fear I must say, generally, 'fierce, bitter and abusive.' The abolition press" (Baptist, or the admission is impertinent,) "has, I believe, from the beginning, too commonly indulged in exaggerated statement, in violent denunciation, and in coarse and lacerating invective. At our late Missionary Convention in Philadelphia, I heard many things from men who claim to be the exclusive friends of the slave, which pained me more than I can express." (C. P. G. was not there, and is not therefore, personally concerned in the matter of this extreme pain of Mr. Wayland.) "It seemed to me that the spirit which many of them manifested was very different from the spirit of Christ." Now, observe with what a gush of brotherly affection, he takes the accuser, whose charges against Baptist Abolitionists he has just so fully and emphatically endorsed, to his bosom; or, rather, with what servility he bows down at his haughty feet.

"I also cheerfully bear testimony to the general courtesy, the Christian urbanity, and the calmness under provocation, which, in a remarkable degree characterized the conduct of the members from the South. . . . I rejoice that a brother from the South has invited this discussion. . . . Should I utter a word that would tend needlessly to wound the feelings of my Southern brethren, there is not one of them that will be

as deeply pained as myself. . . . If abolitionists have treated the subject offensively, this is no sufficient reason why any citizen of a Southern State should not be allowed, without offence, to declare his views," &c.

In his second letter, Mr. W. is careful to exculpate himself, but utters not a word in defence of any other Northern man. He says—"I have never expressed my views of slavery in the form to which you have alluded." Slight and truthful allusion, truly!

Then, after giving his views of slavery, he asks—"Can we conceive of a greater moral evil?" Of having uttered a more severe or "lacerating invective" than is conveyed in this interrogative, has any abolitionist ever been accused? though it may not seem to be quite so "coarse," being put in the gentle form of inquiry, and has the softer words "moral evil" instead of "sin," which is the Bible word, the word "moral" not being once used in the Scriptures, and therefore, Baptist abolitionists prefer to say "sin."

All the way, in his third letter, Mr. W. concedes the guilt of abolitionists indiscriminately, and particularly remarks—"I can never approve of those appeals which treat all men at the South, as though they were, in respect to slavery, under the same condemnation; and which apply to all indiscriminately, epithets which certainly belong to no more than a part. Hence I consider much of the action of churches and associations" (Baptist) "at the North, to be false in principle and unchristian in practice." I deny the correctness of the premises from which these deductions are drawn. The whole South have never been treated in this indiscriminate manner by Baptist Abolitionists, neither do I believe that any abolitionist is justly chargeable with having treated the South in this way. Here, then I ask Mr. Wayland, if he deems the comforting of slaveholders a duty so imperative as to render exaggerations

and misrepresentations more venial offences than if they were committed in an enthusiastic zeal for the overthrow of slavery?

It is an easy work to ascribe to some Northern men great imprudences of which they are not guilty, and "a spirit very different from the spirit of Christ," and then to go away without a suspicion that the spirit which thus deals in calumny, is at all in fault.

Was it to be expected of Francis Wayland, that he would sometime fall in with the cry of "down with the Abolitionists," which twelve years ago issued forth from the dens of reckless, slavery-supporting and mob-fomenting wickedness at New York, which burnt Liberty Hall in Philadelphia, and shed the blood of a Northern minister at Alton, and disgraced even New England with riots and mobs from 1835, till it died away under the power of the indomitable spirit of abolition heroism? At present, it survives only at the South, where Mr. Fuller thinks coerced-by-law illiteracy is a necessary, wise and even kind expedient for preserving the patriarchate from subversion, and where a Southern Baptist Editor (see Baptist Banner and Western Pioneer, June 11, 1846,) copies with evidently pleasurable emotions the following gentlemanly and christian wish—"We wish all of them" (certain abolitionists who speak against the Mexican war) "says the Times, were under the orders of Gen. Taylor, on the Rio Grande, at the present time." (No coarse and lacerating invective here.) "If they would not fight for their country, Gen. Taylor would probably accomodate their wishes" (alluding to a willingness to die as martyrs, rather than join in supporting so unjust a war)—"by hanging them on the nearest tree." Quakers may with impunity refuse to fight or in any way countenance war, but, if an abolitionist refuse, let him be "hung on the nearest tree," echoes a Southern Baptist Editor, in full fellowship with Mr. Fuller and all slaveholders of the South. On such men Mr.

Wayland bestows the most fulsome praise for their piety, while he pours equal censure on his abolition brethren of the North. Take the following as specimens. In his third letter he says:—

“ In the one class” (of slaveholders) “ I perceive the lineaments of the Christian character, in many cases strongly and beautifully expressed.” To Mr. Fuller he says—“ I believe that you have submitted yourself without reserve to the whole will of God, in so far as He shall reveal it to you. I well know the flattering prospects which you abandoned in order to become a preacher of the gospel of Christ.” So he can excuse this slaveholder whose prospects were so flattering (on account of his great powers of mind and distinguished attainments, I take it), from any guilt, on the score of his ignorance—he would do perfectly right, if only God should reveal to him his duty ; as though the Bible did not reveal it to a man of Mr. Fuller’s mental endowments!! In his rejoinder, after Mr. F. had treated the abolition brethren as we have seen, and imputed to God the approval of slaveholding, Mr. Wayland addresses him in the following eulogistic strain—“ My dear Br.—It is needless to assure you that I have read your letters in reply to mine on Domestic Slavery, with profound attention and unfeigned admiration. To the acuteness of one profession, and the learning of another, in both of which you have attained to the highest distinction, you have here added a fervor of eloquence and a richness of illustration peculiarly your own. Never before, I presume, has the defence of slavery on Christian principles, been so ably conducted. Never before, I think, has any thing been written, so admirably calculated to make a favorable impression on those who hold the opposite opinions. Nor is the singular ability displayed in this discussion by any means its highest recommendation. The warm spirit of philanthropy which pervades every part of

your argument, must melt away every prejudice by which it could be resisted ; while the love to God and the reverence for His word (?) which are every where apparent, must, I am sure, give you a place in the affections of every true disciple of our common Lord." " We can both unite in the effort to render all slaveholders in this country, just such masters as you ! ! " " All I ask is, that the views which you entertain, so far as I understand them, be carried out into practice."

Here we have, then, that unprecedented *triumph* of Mr. Wayland over his opponent, of which there was at first so loud a boast among those " moderate men " who had always been " as anti-slavery as any body." I ask the reader to re-peruse this section of this review with care.

I propose now to examine the commonly received opinion that, in consequence of a certain curse pronounced by Noah, the posterity of Ham have ever since held the relation of inferiors towards the posterity of both Japheth and Shem. This opinion is so generally adopted, that I need not be more particular in stating it, in order to be understood. This subject becomes appropriate to this review, by reason of its intimate connection with the practice of slaveholding, the curse alluded to having long been and being still relied upon by many of the advocates of slavery, and constituting the basis, if they have any, of the very important admissions of Mr. Wayland in the following and other forms.

" I grant, at once, that the Hebrews held slaves from the time of the conquest of Canaan, and that Abraham and the patriarchs held them many centuries before. I wonder that any one should have the hardihood to deny so plain a matter of record. I should almost as soon deny the delivery of the ten commandments to Moses." " The people within these limits " (inclosing the Canaanites) " remained under the primitive curse."

If the curse here spoken of does not intend the curse by Noah upon Canaan, as it may refer to the judgment of God against the Canaanites on account of their extreme sinfulness, yet I find that the readers do generally understand it as referring to Noah's curse, and therefore, draw from this passage all that amount of argument for slavery, as being of divine origin, which the opinion I have spoken of implies: moreover, notwithstanding all that is said by Mr. Wayland of the limitation of God's permission of slavery, under the laws of Moses, to the Jews as the slaveholders, and to the Canaanites as the slaves, the admission that Abraham and other patriarchs, many centuries before the time of Moses, had held slaves, can find no foundation in the laws of Moses. This fact carries the reader back to some prior allowance of the practice; and I know of nothing beside the curse uttered by Noah, to which the advocate of slavery attempts to appeal for finding even a semblance of authority. I ask only that the reader will suspend his judgment, and patiently examine the Bible history of mankind from Noah downward some hundreds of years, and the circumstances attending the alleged curse, and the subsequent history of the world.

Commentators have, I believe, generally explained this curse agreeably with the opinion we are to consider; but it may be sufficient, if I quote no more than a few sentences from Matthew Henry. Commenting on Gen. ix: 24—27, this writer says—"The spirit of prophecy comes upon him (Noah) and like dying Jacob, he tells his sons what should befall them. He pronounces a curse on Canaan, in whom Ham is himself cursed. Though divine curses operate slowly, yet, first or last, they will take effect. The Canaanites were under a curse of slavery." "He (God) entails blessings on Shem and Japheth." In this view, Ham is excluded from blessing and made subject to cursing. So deeply impressed

was the mind of Mr. Henry with this idea, that when he finds Nimrod a great warrior, and the first of kings and the founder of the mighty and long prosperous kingdom of Babylon, &c., he says—"It does not appear that he had any right to rule by birth;" because, I take it, Mr. Henry traced this great man's origin to Ham, being a son of Cush, who was one of Ham's four sons. Afterwards, he admits, wonderful as it must have been to him, that even the "cursed" "Canaan had a better land than either Shem or Japheth," and that his "posterity were both numerous, and rich and very pleasantly situated." But he will have it, that he "was under a curse, a divine curse." Of Mizraim, the father of the Egyptians and the founder of that empire which, for so many ages, took the preeminence among the nations of the earth, Mr. Henry seems to have wholly lost the sight. Possibly, this fact may be accounted for in a similar way. Poor (?) Mizraim (Egypt of the Nile) must, of course, be made to rank with things of naught, however enlightened and prosperous and powerful he became and continued for 20 centuries, becoming the schoolmaster people of the world, Greece sitting down at his feet to be instructed into the principles of science, and Rome, afterwards, receiving the same benefit from him,—and all this pity and contempt and forgetfulness of Egypt springs from this stereotyped proof of the Negro's inferiority, got up by slaveholders,—"the curse or prophecy of Noah," which it is high time that Whites should understand.

But, unless I have failed of reading the Bible intelligibly, the White world generally misunderstand the alleged prophecy of Noah, and, therefore, deduce from it, inferences most evidently contradicted by facts. To set this matter in a clear light, may require much and patient inquiry; but the result may richly repay the labor which shall be devoted to the question so long poisoning in doubt, or settled in error.

The efforts to classify mankind according to apparent, or, rather, alleged characteristics of their physical constitution, have been very numerous, and have, by some, been thought to exhibit deep research and great learning. And, if that is deep research which carries the inquirer infinitely beyond or wide of the object sought, and if that is great learning which makes a plain subject confused and consequently mysterious, those efforts certainly entitle their authors to the praise bestowed on them.

I grant that the history of man's origin and present diversified appearance would be both mysterious and inexplicable, if God had not come to our help.

In proof of this remark, I may state that, while some writers on Anthropology (the science of man), divide the human family into five, others reckon six—some sixteen, and others three classes or races; and others still confess themselves unable to determine the number of races.

All the various hypotheses on which these classifications are founded, must, of course, be set down as visionary, except that which arises from the belief of the Mosaic history. This removes all doubt of the origin of the one race, and of the division of that one race at the time of the flood, first into three parts, and afterwards, by subdivision, into many more.

I deem it as great a work of supererogation to give a philosophical account of the diversities existing at present among men, as they seem divided into different races, as to account for the diversities seen to exist in the same family of ten individuals.

It is enough to know that climate affects both form and complexion, and that modes of living and of employment contribute a share to the same end, and that education has much to do with form and expression, if nothing more. It is certain I think, that whatever physical diversities exist, have taken



place under the operation of laws established by the Creator at the beginning. These things are, then, all as they should be ; and it is much more becoming in poor short-sighted mortals to say—"Even so, Father, for so it seemeth good in thy sight"—"Thou hast done all things well"—than to make the physical characteristics of any class of our fellow men an argument or occasion for treating them with disrespect, and for withholding from them the enjoyment of those rights as truly and sacredly bestowed on them as similar rights have been upon ourselves. There is, indeed, an ineffable meanness in trampling on the weak and in making the physical deformities of another either our pastime or an occasion for treating him cruelly or unjustly. Even the common magnanimity of our nature cries out against this ; but the revelations of the Infinite Mind expose its unqualified turpitude. The parent who would not have his little son live to become a fiend, ought to interpose at the first manifestation of this propensity in him and snatch him from the threatened ruin while he may. Unwise indulgence, precisely at this point, has educated thousands for infamy. Though not by any means limited to any one form of this evil or to its injurious bearing on any one description of mankind, I admit distinctly, that the special application of the remarks now made, is to that treatment visited by too many upon that branch of the human family properly called Africans. This word is no more a term of reproach than Europeans, Asiatics or Americans. Africa has had a proud share in the history of human improvement, and I design, at a proper time, to show that Africa, at this moment, contains a numerous population enlightened and elevated. And, if, in our investigations, it should turn out that the world is more deeply in debt to Africans for science and the arts, than to any other people, the discovery may contribute to suppress that vanity so long cherished by some other races,

and to humble that pride of self-superiority they have indulged through a very gross mistake.

A candid examination of the facts recorded in the 10th chapter of Genesis, may introduce us into the light essentially needed on this great question. I call it a great question, because, so long as existing error in relation to the history of the African race, causing them to be regarded as intellectually inferior to other men, shall continue to brood upon the minds of the American people, it will be impossible to reach effectually the slaveholding conscience. This is one of those insurpassable obstacles of which I spoke. It is abundantly proved by the history of slavery and its abolition under the British government, that this obstacle must be removed or destroyed. 'The first triumph we gained in our antislavery warfare, said the benevolent Wilberforce, was the admission that the slave was a human being, which had been shamefully denied. Never did the cause of the slave, exert any general and effective influence on the minds of the British public, until, by the efforts—the humble, faithful, self-denying, and persevering labors of Christian Missionaries, the slaves of the British West Indies were intellectually and morally enlightened, and, therefore came up into view as an improvable race. Now it was that a natural respect for their humanity, for their intellectual improvability, took possession of the British mind, and a recognition of their moral brotherhood awakened the sympathies of the British heart. Then Christianity lifted up her voice in the souls of our English brethren, and spoke to be obeyed, and no longer to be listened to with leaden ears and an unfeeling heart.

A like influence will be exerted on the public mind in America, by a collation of historical facts, which will establish, beyond controversy, the rightfulness of the African's claim to intellectual and moral equality with the European.

Many of you are aware, I doubt not, that it has been established beyond all reasonable doubt, that the Egyptians and Ethiopians of the ancient world, so renowned in the arts of peace and of war, were the ancestors of the modern Africans. This fact places that race on an equal footing with Europeans, in intellectual power and capability for improvement. I leave this point, important as it is, without going into an argument which might double the size of this book, and with only an earnest request that the reader will carefully examine the history of the origin of the several races as given by Moses, particularly in the tenth chapter of Genesis, and with a quotation of the opinion of the learned traveler and historian Volney, which he states in the following manner. Commenting on the historical statement of Herodotus that the Colchians and Egyptians were black with hair short and curling, he says—"That is, the ancient Egyptians were real negroes, of the same species with all the natives of Africa."

#### THE MAIN QUESTION.

It can not have escaped the notice of any observer, the last—the forlorn hope of all defenders of slavery, is that they shall be able to persuade the Christian world to believe in the silence of the New Testament on the question whether slavery is or is not sinful. What they finally seek is, not any expressed approval of their practice of holding men in slavery: for, though they commonly set out with a show of believing the existence of such approval, they soon abandon the untenable position and retreat behind the pretence of the absolute silence of Christ and his apostles.

So Mr. Fuller seizes with the utmost anxiety on Mr. Wayland's admission that the gospel contains no express precept forbidding slavery.

Although I have already taken a brief notice of this point in remarking on Mr. Fuller (see p. 122), its importance is too

great to allow of leaving it without further examination. Here, too, is the more appropriate place for its examination, since the admission comes from Mr. Wayland: for, though he has said many things of weight and employed much of sound and unanswerable argument against slavery, with the slaveholder all those things go for nothing, their force being neutralized by the one fatal admission, which, if it were now made by myself, would at once be trumpeted through the land as an abandonment of every thing I have ever said or written against slavery. The same would be the case of every other abolitionist in America. Once make the admission, and it is impossible to guard against such a result. It is the fire which consumes the best building ever reared by an opponent of slavery, and it is for this reason that whoever has made it, is looked upon with entire indifference at the South, or is triumphantly reckoned among the sustainers of slavery. Therefore, Mr. Fuller said, that he had rather Mr. Wayland's letters should be circulated at the South than any thing which he could write.

The admission is made by Mr. W. in these words—"All that can justly be said seems to be this—the New Testament contains no precept prohibitory of slavery. This must, I think, be granted; but this is all."

Yes—it is all the slaveholder asks: but, without any feeling of hazard, I aver that the New Testament does contain a "precept" as explicitly "prohibitory of slavery" as of any other sin. Mark the words—a "precept prohibitory of slavery." I will not descend to a definition of the word "precept," for whoever does not know the meaning of this word, is not able to read an English book understandingly.

So of the "precept prohibitory of slavery," which I single out from among scores of similar precepts contained in the New Testament—it is couched in the most simple and

explicit terms, level to any capacity. Let it be noted, however, that the "precept" is not expressed by the few words—"It shall not be so among you"—but by these defined by the associated declarations preceding and following them.

"But JESUS called them (the disciples) unto him and said—Ye know that the princes (hoi archontes) of the Gentiles exercise dominion (katakurieuousi) over them, (their subjects) and they that are great (hoi megaloi) exercise authority (katexousiazousi) upon them. **BUT IT SHALL NOT BE SO AMONG YOU**: but whosoever will be great (megas) among you, let him be your minister (diakonos, deacon). And whosoever will be chief (protos) among you, let him be your servant (doulos). Even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto (diakonethenai) but to minister (diakonesai) and to give his life a ransom for many."

Ambiguity and mysteriousness belong to the teachers of error: but the great Author of Christianity exhibits truth with so much explicitness that the wayfaring man, though not remarkable for the learning of the schools, nor gifted with more than ordinary powers of intellect, needs not misunderstand His instructions. Even when He chose to teach in parables, His purpose was illustration, and His meaning was commonly apprehended by the common people; while the Doctors of the Law, through their habits of speaking and thinking metaphysically and mysteriously, wrought up those plain illustrative parables into mysteries, and pretended that they saw no light in them. They did evil, and, as is well known of every one that doeth evil, they hated the light which would, if admitted into their own minds, reveal that evil in the form of guilt to themselves, and, if permitted to fall upon their practices, would expose the turpitude of those practices, and the guilt of their enactors to an observing community, against whose rights and interests those evil deeds were done. If, while they devoured widows' houses, they could, by long prayers, or an ostentation of piety, becloud their own consciences, and make the people stand in awe of them, and think that it was right for such godly men to devour the

property of the poor, they would secure three great objects of high interest to them.

1. They would have peace within.
2. The community would praise and not blame them.
3. They would accumulate wealth without the toil of earning or producing it.

These three things being secured, they would be prepared for the enjoyments congenial with their corrupt moral taste. In this way I think I am able to perceive the meaning of the Savior's words—"but unto them in parables, that seeing they might or would not see, and hearing they might not understand":—not that his teachings were not clear, but were contrary to their tastes and supposed interests.

The precept I have selected is so far from being a parable that it is the directest possible prohibition of a moral evil to which the human heart is so prone as to need to be fenced about—walled in—from its indulgence by the sternest prohibitory enactments of Divine legislation, even after men have been regenerated, as were the personal disciples to whom the text was addressed.

Since this was true of them, it may not be supposed that converted men now have risen above this necessity; and, certainly, a mere profession of being a disciple of Christ can not exempt the man from such necessity. "But it shall not be so among you"—said the Christian Lawgiver, then; "It shall not be so among you," utters the same unchanging authority, now. That this language is not a mere prophecy or statement of what would not be among professed Christians, appears from the words associated with these. "But whosoever will be great among you let him be your minister." Here is, both in Greek and English, the imperative mode, and by association it spreads its imperative force over the whole passage,—“let him be”—“it shall not be”—both phrases be-

ing equally imperative in their intention, "It shall not be so among you"—ye shall not so do—ye are forbidden to do so, or as the gentiles do.

We have not yet inquired what act or practice is prohibited—it being hitherto our purpose to show that the language is direct and explicit, and imperative or prohibitory, designed to forbid some wrong. We shall readily perceive what is the wrong prohibited by reading the context. Matt. xx. 21—28.

The same instruction and prohibition are found in Luke xxii. 24—30, though somewhat differently expressed.

What, then, is the moral wrong which Christ here so lucidly exposes, and so absolutely forbids? Can a world of readers fail of understanding the passage alike? or can they see any other than the same thing prohibited?

Among the gentiles or heathen, Slavery was practised every where. The measure of power was with them, being without God and his revealed will, the measure of right. Rome was then the dominant power—the will of that government was the law over the surrounding nations. The Jews were subject to that power. Christ himself recognized Cæsar's authority and paid him tribute, or directed his disciples to do so. Rome was a slaveholding government; and so far did the claims set up by that government over the slaves extend, that it was decreed, or virtually and practically settled under that government, that slaves were not men, but beasts, and were so to be regarded. These slaves, let it be observed and remembered, were white people, generally or chiefly. The tyranny which was exercised on the throne, diffused itself down through all the subordinate offices and grades of office, and spread wide through the aristocratic community. Private individuals possessed themselves of slaves according to their wealth and choice, and wielded over them an absolute despotism; and those who thus exercised authority upon them, i. e.

all these tyrants from Cæsar down, as Christ informs us, were called benefactors, or well-doers, or righteous men. They called themselves so, and were so called and considered by each other. The oppressed, who were groaning beneath the intolerable burthen, did not so regard them, neither would they call them so, except coerced to utter with their lips a libel on their own souls. But, among the heathen of Christ's day on the earth, such tyrants agreed in accounting each other benefactors or righteous people, and set up the claim that there were no others so good as they. They regarded themselves as the peculiar favorites of the gods.

Christ came down and dwelt among them, and taught them his religion, and uttered the laws of his kingdom, a kingdom, too, which was to fill the whole world. And now, though he became a citizen and subject of the Roman government, and directed his followers to give unto Cæsar the things which were Cæsar's, did he approve of the doings of that government, or did he remain silent in regard to its despotic practices? In our text he means something, and I know not that language can be framed to describe any thing more explicitly than the language of the text and context describes that thing; or that a prohibition can be more clearly or more emphatically legislated and declared than this: "But it shall not be so among you." All the oppressions practised under the same government were now to be condemned. It is clear that a moral principle which runs through a class of actions and forbids them all, visits upon the various degrees of evil-doing a measure of censure and rebuke, proportionate to the magnitude of the various evils done; so that the perpetrator of the greater wrong is worthy of a corresponding punishment. The man, therefore, who unjustly robs another of his entire estate, is more guilty than another who robs the rich of a single sheaf of wheat.



The Bible every where sets forth the robbery of the poor as a crime of superlative heinousness ; for, though it be a small amount, it is his living. The robbery of the poor has in it the meanness and cruelty of snatching the indispensable morsel from the lips of the man dying with hunger. All the faculties of intellect and affection cry out against such a wrong as the most flagrant and shameful. You may impose burthens on the strong and healthy with pardonable guilt ; but to load down the weak, fainting, pallid victim of a consumption, with any amount of weight, would be justly called unpardonable. Allow not, then, yourselves to think that Christ took a sympathetic part with the comparatively strong—though he shall, indeed, have his portion with the strong, or be as strong as the strongest, for he will exert that strength on behalf of his suffering poor ; and woe be to the strong who shall resist him,—their strength shall be as tow—as the spider’s web—as the giving up of the ghost.

We are, therefore, to understand the Christian Lawgiver, when He stands in the midst of his disciples, and declares—“ But it shall not be so among you,” as meaning that they shall not do the oppressions which are done by the heathen,—that they shall wrong no man, and, especially and superlatively, that they shall not oppress the weak—the widows, the fatherless—them who have no helper. The man already crippled by the impositions of tyranny—reduced to a defenseless condition by the laws of a tyrannical government, is the *last* man you may crush still lower ; nay, he is the man whom you must soonest relieve, and defend, and support, or you disregard the laws of Christ, and treat with sacrilege the sanctity of the inclosures Divine wisdom and goodness have, by the gospel, erected around him,—the slave is that man.

The gentiles oppress the weak ; “ but it shall not be so among you.” “ Support the weak ; ” succor the defenseless ;

fly to the relief of him who has no helper. The half-dead victim of thieves, who have robbed him of his own wages ; of his children, wife, parents ; and of himself : who have robbed him of the Bible with all its needed light, and promises and hopes ; that is the oppressed one who, above all others, is to receive your sympathies and your assistance ; else, says " the Author of " a " Moral Science," which pours infinite contempt on all counteracting systems : " else, ye can not be my disciples."

The gentiles oppress ; they rob the poor and the needy, " but it shall not be so among you." One of our modern Northern wise men ; one who calls himself " the Author of the Moral Science," has admitted to the slaveholder that the gospel does not contain any direct prohibitory precept against Slavery. When you hear the Lord Jesus declare that the despots of the gentiles exercise lordship over the people, and exercise authority upon them : " But it shall not be so among you ;" do you discover any want of either explicitness or directness in this " prohibitory precept ?" Shall we abandon a precept like this, and search about among the ignes fatui of moral sophists, whose highest rule of right is expediency, to find, if we may chance to do so, to light upon something which may, possibly, serve as a pretext for abolition, and that too, for the purpose of relieving the oppressor from the vexations and dangers to which his slaves subject him, rather than to do any justice to the slaves ? That may, perhaps, be thought to be a subtle and acute philosophy which can so pervert the passage under view from its direct preceptive character, and so cover its broad sunlight with a bushel, that it can no more be properly called a direct precept prohibiting Slavery ; but such philosophy the plainness of scripture language, and the decisions of unsophisticated reason and common sense, will agree in regarding as that " philosophy falsely so called," of which Paul warned the Colossian brethren to beware, lest

some one should beguile them by it, lest it should spoil them ; “ a philosophy and vain deceit, after the traditions of men, after the rudiments of the world,” (just such a world as those gentiles made it) “ and not after Christ.” (Col. xi. 8.)

If Jesus Christ had said to his disciples—the gentiles are slaveholders, but ye shall not be—the “ precept” would have been no more explicit and decisive, or “ prohibitory” than it is now. It would, indeed, have limited the prohibition to Slavery, whereas it now takes in all the forms in which oppression may exist ; and, since Slavery, or the forcible depriving a man of the enjoyment of every one of his rights, does, in fact, include every possible wrong of oppression, under one form, the necessity of another form, in order to make the wrong complete, is superseded. Slavery compared with any minor, I may say, any other form of oppression, is like decapitation compared with a curable flesh wound more or less severe. When, therefore, Jehovah prohibits the doing any measure of wrong to our fellow man, the obligation and force of that prohibition, instead of being annulled by the extreme of wrong-doing, are perfected or come themselves to be extreme. Such is Gospel “ ultraism.”

If we were, at this point, to speak of penalties, we should be obliged to show that the penalty must be apportioned to the offence ; and, therefore, they who impose on others the largest oppression, deserve the heaviest penalty. This principle is acknowledged in its application to every other species of wrong ; and nothing but a peculiar blindness superinduced by the influence of selfishness, pride and evil passions, prevents its application to the unsurpassed crime of Slavery. Many have come to make this application already, and their number is daily increasing, as divine truth takes effect on their minds and triumphs over the evil which makes the heart inimical to right.

It may serve to corroborate these views, to consider the positive requirement or injunction which the Savior places in immediate connection with the prohibition which has been examined.

To this I shall not need to devote more than a few words, while my readers will give many thoughts. But whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister, or deacon, as the word is in the Greek. And whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant: the Greek word here is *doulos*, which signifies an auxiliary or helper.

If any could desire to find authority given to the disciples to enslave each other, let such observe that, in order to derive such authority from this passage, the rule must be that, in case any one disciple should be lifted up and aspire to superiority over his brethren, they are to unite their power against him, and to drag him down into the condition of a slave; in doing which, however, they would become guilty of the very crime, which they would undertake to punish in the aspirant. Such an absurdity is not ascribable to the teachings of Christ.

His intention is, therefore, in the words, "let him be your servant," that, instead of aspiring to authority over others to their humiliation, it is and ever shall be the Christian's duty (and all men are required to be Christians and obey the gospel); it is the duty of every Christian; of every man; to repress and subdue his own pride and to cultivate humility. To enforce this duty, and, at the same time, to illustrate the real nature of humility, and to show that, so far from being identical with degradation and meanness, it is true honor; such even as befits the Son of God himself; he adds, "Even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and" (as the perfection of humility;) "to give his life a ransom for many."

Oh, how are pride, and all oppression, rebuked in man, as

he approaches the meek and lowly Redeemer! as we go with the wise men from the East to visit the humble birth-place in Bethlehem; as we join company with his followers and see him going about doing good, shunning the palaces of the great, collecting the poor from the highways and the hedges to preach to them his gospel; taking up his abode with the family of Mary and Martha and Lazarus; retiring to some secluded spot for prayer on behalf of his proud persecutors; entering the garden of Gethsemane, borne down with sorrow for a wicked, thoughtless, perishing world; then bearing the cross on which, under the gaze of a deriding multitude, and amidst their loud mockeries, He was to expiate sin! This is humility; we need no logical definition of the word: we see its full meaning in the person of our Lord. Would you dare be a slaveholder now? Do the precepts, illustrated in the example of Christ, furnish a defence for Slavery? So far from it, all those numerous precepts authoritatively uttered by him against every species of injustice and unkindness and indifference to the woes of others, are summed up in these few words, as they stand explained by him and gloriously illustrated by his example; "It shall not be so among you." With this "prohibitory precept," applying with more emphasis to Slavery than any other form of oppression, because all others are inferior to this one, I commit this Review to the public, and pray that the God of the poor and oppressed will bless it, with all its imperfections, to the accomplishing of some good.

## REFERENCES TO DOULOS.

The following list contains ALL the Texts in the *New Testament*, where the word *Doulos* and other words derived from the same root are used.

### Δουλος.

MATT.—viii. 9; x. 24, 25; xiii. 27, 28; xviii. 23, 26, 27, 28, 32; xx. 27; xxi. 34, 35, 36; xxii. 6, 8, 10; xxiv. 45, 46, 48, 50; xxv. 14, 19, 21, 26, 30; xxvi. 51.  
 MARK.—x. 44; xii. 2, 4; xiii. 34; xiv. 47.  
 LUKE.—ii. 29; vii. 2, 3, 8, 10; xii. 37, 38, 45, 47; xiv. 17, 21, 22, 23; xv. 22; xvii. 7, 9, 10; xix. 13, 15, 17, 22; xx. 10, 11; xxii. 50.  
 JOHN.—iv. 51; viii. 34, 35; xiii. 16; xv. 15, 20; xviii. 10, 18, 26.  
 ACTS.—ii. 18; iv. 29; xvi. 17. ROM.—i. 1; vi. 16, 17, 19, 20.  
 I. COR.—vii. 21, 22, 23; xii. 13. II. COR.—iv. 5.  
 GAL.—i. 10; iii. 28; iv. 1, 7. EPH.—vi. 5, 6, 8. PHIL.—i. 1; ii. 7.  
 COL.—iii. 11, 22; iv. 1, 12. I. TIM.—vi. 1.—II. TIM. ii. 24.  
 TITUS—i. 1; ii. 9.—PHILEMON, 16.—JAMES, i. 1.  
 I. PET.—ii. 16.—II. PET., i. 1; ii. 19.—JUDE, 1.  
 REV.—i. 1; ii. 20; vi. 15, vii. 3; x. 7; xi. 18; xiii. 16; xv. 3; xix. 2, 5, 18; xxii. 3, 6.

### Δουλη.

LUKE—i. 38, 48.—ACTS, ii. 1, 8.

### Δουλευω.

MATT.—vi. 24.—LUKE, xv. 29; xvi. 13.—JOHN, viii. 33.—ACTS, vii. 7; xx. 19.  
 ROM.—vi. 6; vii. 6, 25; ix. 12; xii. 11; xiv. 18; xvi. 18.  
 GAL.—iv. 8, 9, 25; v. 13.—EPH., vi. 7.—PHIL., ii. 22.  
 COL.—iii. 24.—I. THESS., i. 9.—I. TIM., vi. 2.—TITUS, iii. 3.

### Δουλωω.

ACTS—vii. 6.—ROM., vi. 18, 22.—I COR., vii. 15; ix. 19.—GAL., iv. 3.  
 TITUS—ii. 3. II. PETER.—ii. 19.

In the OLD TESTAMENT we give a few references.

LEV.—xxv. 44.—I. SAM. xxv. 41, (translated handmaid.) xxix. 3; xxx. 13.—II. SAM., xviii. 29.—I. KINGS., xi. 26; xii. 7.—NEH. ii. 10.—PS. cv. 17.—PROV., xi. 29; xii. 9.—IS., xlix. 7.—JER., ii. 14. (The word *Slave* in this verse is not in the original, as any will observe, it being printed in italic.) DAN., vi. 20.—ZECH., iii. 8.—MAL., i. 6.

# THE HIRELING MINISTRY

NONE OF

**CHRIST'S :**

OR

A DISCOURSE

TOUCHING THE PROPAGATING THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST  
JESUS;

**Humbly Presented to**

SUCH PIOUS AND HONORABLE HANDS WHOM THE PRESENT  
DEBATE THEREOF CONCERNS.

~~~~~  
BY ROGER WILLIAMS,

OF PROVIDENCE, IN NEW ENGLAND.  
~~~~~

LONDON:

PRINTED IN THE SECOND MONTH.

1652.

## INTRODUCTION.



The reprint of any discourse preached by such a man as ROGER WILLIAMS, two hundred years ago, may reasonably awaken not only curiosity, but a solemn interest. Few men of any age have left on the world's mind a more permanent impression; and that impression is decidedly favorable to religion and gospel virtue. He is not now regarded as either a gloomy ascetic, or a fanatical zealot; neither do men think of him as either a selfish politician, fawning at the feet of royalty, to secure emolument, or a headstrong mutineer against government, or a wily traitor to his country. And yet what religionist ever promulgated sentiments more novel to the times or more antagonistical to the prevailing Church policy? or what politician ever more firmly planted his foot in opposition to governmental assumption of power? or advocated principles of a true Republicanism, with a truer zeal, though a subject of Royalty?

His triumph will ever stand as a great fact for the light and encouragement of reformers, who respect truth for its intrinsic beauty and value, and who fear God more than earthly dishonor; for, though he was calumniated by many of that age, his works have followed him since, diffusing a light which occasions the admiration of both the pious and the profane. God is glorified in him.

In publishing this discourse, it is concluded, while the language is left unaltered, to employ the modern orthography after the first page or two.

EDITOR.



## DISCOURSE.

---

In this discourse are briefly touched these particulars :

1. The Nationall and Parishional Constitution of Churches, is found to be the Grand Idoll of the Nation.

2. The inforcing of the Nation to Such a Constitution is the greatest Soul oppression in this Nation.

3. The Hireling Ministrie attending upon Such Assemblies or others is none of the Ministrie of Christ Jesus.

4. The Univirsities of the Nation, as Subordinate and Subservient to such Ministries and Churches, are none of the Institutions of Christ Jesus.

5. It is absolute duty of the Civil State to Set free the Souls of all men from that so long oppressing yoake of such Ministries and Churches. Yet

6. Ought the nation and every person in it, be permitted to see with its own eyes, and to make free choice of what worship and Ministrie, and maintenance they please, whether parochial or otherwise ?

7. The Apostolical Commission and Ministrie is long since interrupted and discontinued. Yet

8. Ever since the beast Antichrist rose, the Lord hath stirred up the Ministrie of Prophesie, who must continne their witness and prophesie until their witness be finished and Slaughters probably neer approaching accomplished.

9. The provocation of the holy eyes is great in all Courts throughout the nation by millions of legal oaths which if not redressed, may yet be a fire kindled from his jealousy ; who will not hold him guiltless which taketh his name in vain.

10. The free permitting of the consciences and meetings of conscionable and faithful people throughout the Nation, and the free permission of the Nation to frequent such assemblies, will be one of the principal Means and Expedients (as the present State of Christianity stands) for the propagating of the Gospel of the Son of God.



To All such Honourable and Pious hands, whom the present Debate touching the propagation of Christ's Gospel concerns :

And to

All such gentle Bereans, who with ingenious civility desire to search whether what is presented concerning Christ Jesus, be so or not.

All humble respective Salutations.

It being a present high Debate (Honorable and Beloved) how the Gospel of Christ Jesus might more be propagated in this Nation: 2. And being desired by eminent friends, to cast in my mite towards it. 3. And having been engaged in several points of this nature, in my former and later endeavours, against that Bloody Tenent of persecution for cause of Conscience: 4. And also having been forced to observe Goings of God, and the Spirits of men, both in Old and New England, as touching the Church, the Ministry and Ordinances of Jesus Christ, I did humbly apprehend my call from America, not to hide my Candle under a Bed of Ease and Pleasure or a Bushel of Gain and Profit; but to set it on a Candlestick of this public profession for the benefit of others, and the Praise of the Father of all Lights and Godliness.

2. For the Substance and most of this, I suddenly drew it up, and delivered two copies unto two eminent friends of Jesus Christ and this Nation: But being importuned for more Copies than I was possibly able to transcribe and being (therefore) advised by some Honourable friends, to use the help of the Press; I am thus beyond my first Intentions and Desires, held forth in public.

3. If ought I have expressed seem harsh, dissatisfactory, or offensive, I am humbly bold (I hope in the power of the Most High) to profess my readiness to discuss, debate, dispute; either by Word or Writing, with whom or whom-

soever the present Debate concerns, with all Christian Meekness, and due Submission.

4. It is true I absolutely deny it (against all comers) to be the burthen of the Civill State to take Cognizance of any Spiritual cause; and I do positively assert it, to be the proper alone work of the holy Son and Spirit of God in the hands of his Saints and Prophets to manage heavenly and Spiritual causes (and that only with Spiritual weapons against Spiritual oppositions,) and therefore that the higher Powers have been constantly deceived by the Mercenary and Hireling Ministers; who being themselves deceived, deceive; and take about (as the Wind, and Time, and advantage blows) from Popery to Protestantism, from Protestantism to Popery, from Popery to Protestantism again! from Prelacy to Presbyterie, from Presbyterie, many to Independency; and will again to Presbyterie and Prelacy, if not to Popery (in some cases,) rather than lose (as they say) the Liberty of Preaching: But what that loss is of somewhat else (Gain, Honour &c.) let themselves, and all men judge impartially in the fear of God. Yet

5. I humbly acknowledge (as to Personal worth) I deal with men, for many Excellent gifts, elevated above the common rank of men; yea and for personal Holiness (many of them) worthy of all Christian love and Honor, in which respects when I look down upon myself, I am really persuaded to acknowledge my unworthiness to hold a Candle or a Book unto them. And yet, if I give flattering titles unto men, my Maker (saith Elihu) would quickly take me away; and why therefore (since I have not been altogether a Stranger to the Learning of the Egyptians and have trod the hopefulest paths to Worldly preferment, which for Christ's sake I have forsaken) since I know what it is to Study, to preach, to be an Elder, to be applauded; and yet also what it is to tug at the Oar, to dig with the Spade and Plow, and to labor and travel day and night amongst English, amongst Barbarians! Why should I not be humbly bold to give my witness faithfully, to give my counsel effectually, and to persuade with some truly pious and conscientious spirits, rather to return to Law, to Physic, to Soldiery, to Educating of Children, to Digging (and yet not cease from Prophesying) rather than to live under the Slavery, ye, and the censure (from Christ Jesus and his Saints and others also) of a Mercenary and Hireling Ministry?

6. To which end my humble and hearty cry is to the Father of Lights, to plead with all his Children of Light effectually ; so that they look up, wonder, and say, am I a child of Light ? Is the Father of Lights my Father, and the Saints my fellow Brethren and Scholars in Christ Jesus, the Children of Light also ? What make I then in dark places, like those that have been dead of old ? What make I amongst the Graves and Tombs ; the Livings, Benefices, Promotions, Stipends, &c. ? I have told a quick passage between the truly noble Earl of Essex (in Queen Elizabeth her days) and a truly able and zealous Non-conformist : I have, the Earl, been studying a great while these two points ; first the Persons of the Bishops ; and I have labored with the Queen to prefer none but good men to her Bishoprics : The next thing is their places, which if I find them to be as bad as their Persons be ; then, then, &c. But they soon cropt off that noble head, &c.

That same blessed Spirit breathes (I doubt not) in many heavenly Spirits of our times in Parliament, in Council, in the Army ; and their holy desire hath been to prefer the choice and flower of able and Godly men to places, in City, in Country, in University. It may yet so please the Father of Spirits to stir up their noble minds to meditate as well Hireling places as they have too well Known their persons. It may also be, that his most holy and pure Eye sees they have been highly honored, and enough already : more work is left for growing Sprigs, for whom some crowns are kept to which their father's heads were not so fitted.

7. And yet although I humbly give the Civil State its Right, to wit, to take down places or persons which themselves or Fathers have erected ; yet am I also far from taking off a yoke from one to clap it on the neck of others. Let the Towns, the Parishes, and Divisions of people in the three nations be undisturbed by any civil Sword from their consciences and worships ; though traditional, though Parochial ; and let their maintenance be by Tenths and Fifths or how freely they please.

1. Only let it be their soul's choice and no enforcing Sword, but what is Spiritual in their Spiritual causes.

2. I plead for impartiality and equal freedom, peace and safety to the consciences and assemblies, unto which the people may as freely go, and this according to each con-

science what conscience this conscience or (not transgressing against civilities) whether of Jew or Gentile.

Object. But would you have, say some, Jews, Turks, and Papists live in Protestant countries? I answer I judge it here only seasonable to say that I humbly conceive, that this objection, and all that can be said (as to piety or policy) is satisfied in my late unwashing of M. Cotton's washing of the Bloody Tenet: in that late Endeavor I humbly hope, I have made it evident that no opinion in the world is comparably so bloody or so blasphemous as that of punishing, and not permitting, in a civil way of Cohabitation, the consciences and worships, both of Jews and Gentiles.

Ireland hath been an Akeldama, a field of Blood; probably it is, that the guilt of all that Blood, Protestant and Papist will fall upon this Bloody Tenet, of which both Papist and Protestant are guilty, to wit, of not permitting the Heretics, the Blasphemers, &c., as the Sword falls either into the hand of a Popish or a Protestant Victor.

What a voice from heaven is there, in the forepast ages of our Fathers now rotten under us! From Henry the second his time, unto Henry the eighth, while their consciences had freedom under Popish Kings of England, how little blood was spilt English or Irish, compared with the showers and rivers both of one and the other spilt in the few years of our Protestant Princes, while the consciences of the Catholics have been restrained by the civil Sword and penalties?

8. In the discourse it will appear, how greatly some mistake, which say I declaim against all Ministries, all Churches, all Ordinances; for I professedly avow and maintain, that since the Apostacy, and the interrupting of the first ministry and order, God has graciously and immediately stirred up and sent forth the ministry of his Prophets who during all the reign of Antichrists, have prophesied in sackcloth, and the saints and people of God have more or less gathered to and assembled with them; they have prayed and fasted together, and exhorted and comforted each other, and so do, notwithstanding that some are not persuaded and satisfied (as others conceive themselves to be) as touching the doctrines of Baptisms, and laying on of hands.

Lastly, whatever be the Issue of all their public agitations, my humble and hearty cry to the Father of mercies is for every soul in the three Nations, that desire to fear him; whether of

higher of lower rank, that we may more and more cry, and endeavor for assurance of personal reconciliation in the blood of the lamb, more and more for participation of the divine Nature in the purity and holiness of the spirit of God: more and more lament (with Jeremy) the division and desolations of God's people and the holy Ordinances and Worship of God in Christ Jesus; more and more press after love and all possible communion with God's people in the midst of many differences; more and more abound in mercy and compassion to the souls and consciences; and woful conditions of others, Jews or Gentiles, and more and more prepared with the golden sheaves of the preparation of the Gospel of peace, ready for all the good pleasure of God in Christ Jesus; for prosperity, for adversity, for abundance, for want, for liberty, for imprisonment, for honor, for dishonor, for life, for death, as knowing that they that suffer with Jesus, shall not only Reign with him, but here also in the midst of outward sorrows, be filled with Joy unspeakable, and full of Glory.

Being desired by some Loving Friends to cast in my mite as to that Heavenly proposition of Propagating the Gospel of Christ Jesus, I am humbly bold to propose these conclusions, and their consecutaries following.

The two Great Prophets of God's Revealed Counsel, Moses (the Servant) and Christ Jesus (the Lord) as they have both declared unto us a Creation, a Creator, the Shipwreck of mankind, the Restoration, the Restorer, so have they both revealed unto us a Visible Company of the Holy Worshipers of this one most glorious Creator and Redeemer, and that as for his own most glorious praise, so in opposition to all false Gods, who also are attended with their visible worships and worshippers.

In order to God's visible worship, the Lord Jesus hath broken down the wall of division between the Jews and the rest of the Nations of the World and sent forth his Ministers (Wisdom's Maids) unto all Nations, to bring in (by the Gospel's invitation) Proselytes, Converts, Disciples, such as should eternally be saved, to begin that eternal and heavenly Communion in heaven, here in an holy and visible worship on earth.

This Going forth of the true Ministers of Christ Jesus is represented under the figure of the white troops in the opening of the first seal where the Lord Jesus in his first messengers

rode forth upon the white horse or horses of the word of truth and meekness (Psal. 75,) conquering and to conquer in the souls of men.

Thirdly. From the 6—8 Revelation to the 19 we hear no more of those white horsemen, that is (as I conceive) the Apostles or messengers of Jesus Christ; (the whole insinuating a total routing of the Church and Ministry of Christ Jesus, put to flight, and retired into the wilderness of desolation.)

Fourthly. During the dreadful apostacy and desolation, the Lord hath not left the world without witness, but hath graciously and wonderfully stirred up his holy Prophets and Witnesses such as were before the Waldenses more obscure, but more eminently the Waldenses, the Wickliffists, the Hussites, the Lutherans, the Calvinists (so called) who have as witnesses prophesied and mourned in sackcloth 1260 days or years (prophetically) I say mourned for the routing, desolating of the Christian Church or army: and panted and labored after the most glorious Rally thereof, and Restoration.

This Testimony is probably near finished and the saints by their late and yet following wars (I say probably) must enrage the anti-christian world, so far as to provoke the nations, to their great and general slaughter, called the slaughter of the witnesses. Rev. 11. After which and their shame three years and a half, forthwith their most glorious and joyful Rising.

These witnesses, these prophets, are probably those one hundred and forty four thousand virgins, mystical Israelites, twelve times twelve, which stand with the Lamb on Mount Zion, against the Romish Beast and are the same number sealed twelve times twelve. Rev. 7.

But there is in the same seventh Chapter, a numberless number, which no man can number, to wit, the Converts of the Nations of the world, which must yet come flowing unto Christ Jesus, after this his famous second Conquest over the Devil, the dragon in the Roman Popes, having before triumphed over him in the Roman Emperors.

The World divided (say our ablest Cosmographers) into thirty parts, as yet, but five of thirty have heard of the sweet name of Jesus a Savior: His Messengers must yet go forth into the other twenty-five, after the downfall of the Papacy, when also at the fullness of the Gentiles, or Nations coming

in, shall be the joyful Raising us from the Dead of the (Accursed and yet Beloved Nation of the) Jews. Rom. 11. Rev. 18 and 19.

The *Civil State* of the Nations being merely and essentially civil, cannot (Christianly) be called *Christian States*, after the pattern of that holy and typical Land of *Canaan*, which I have proved at large in the *Bloody Tenet*, to be a *Non-such* and an unparalleled Figure of the *Spiritual State* of the *Church of Christ Jesus, dispersed*, yet gathered to him in all *Nations*.

The civil Sword, (therefore) cannot (rightfully) act either in Restraining the Souls of the people from Worship, &c., or in constraining them to Worship. Considering that there is not a Tittle in the New Testament of Christ Jesus, that commits the Forming or Reforming of his Spouse and Church, to the civil and Worldly Powers.

Fifthly. No man ever did nor ever shall truly go forth to convert the Nations, nor to Prophecy in the present state of Witnesses against Antichrist, but by the gracious Inspiration and Instigation of the Holy Spirit of God, according to 1 Cor. 12., where the Holy Spirit discoursing of those three (Gifts, Administrations, Operations,) tells us that no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Spirit; and Rev. 11. I will give power to my two Witnesses, &c.

I prejudice not an External Test and call, which was at first and shall be again in force at the Resurrection of the Churches, (as Mr. Cotton himself calls it, in Rev. 20.) But in the present state of things, I cannot but be humbly bold to say, that I know no other True Tender, but the Holy Spirit, and when he sends, his Messengers will go, his Prophets will prophesy, though all the World should forbid them.

From the former conclusions, we may first see upon what a false Scent or Word, our Fathers and ourselves have run, as to the true Ministry appointed by Christ Jesus: How many thousand Pretenders have been and are (Protestants and Papists) to that Grand Commission, Matth. 28—Go into all Nations, Teach and Baptize, &c.

In the poor small span of my Life, I desired to have been a diligent and constant observer, and have myself many ways engaged, in City, in Country, in Court, in Schools, in Universities, in Churches, in Old and New England, and yet cannot in the holy presence of God, bring in the Result of a sat-



isfying discovery, that either the Begetting Ministry of the Apostles or Messengers to the Nations, or the Feeding and Nourishing Ministry of Pastors and Teachers, according to the first Institution of the Lord Jesus, are yet restored and extant.

It may then be said, what is that Ministry that has been extant since Luther and Calvin's time (especially what is that Ministry that has been instrumental in the hand of the Lord to the conversion of thousands?) I answer, the Ministry of Prophets or Witnesses, standing with Christ Jesus, against his great co-rival, and competitor, Antichrist. Rev. 10—11.

The whole Books of Martyrs (or Witnesses) is nothing else but a large Commentary or History, of the Ministry of Witnesses, during all the Reign of the Beast, to this day.

Look upon Berengarius with the Saints, enlightened by him; Look upon Waldus, with his Waldenses in France, Wickliffe in England, John Huss, and Jerome of Prague in Bohemia, Luther in Germany, Calvin in Geneva, those Parts, and other places, and Countries. Now examine these Witnesses in two Particulars.

1st. Negatively, wherein they Witnessed against the False, against the Usurpations and Abominations of Antichrist, and therein they were the Infallible Witnesses, and Prophets of Christ Jesus, Preaching, and oft times Suffering to the Death, for his Name sake. But

2d. View them in their Positive Practice and Worships, as they have assumed and pretended to such and such Ministries, and Titles, and Churches, and Ministrations; and there is not one of Them—no not Calvin himself (the greatest pretender to Church Order.) But the Father of Lights, in our times of Light hath been graciously pleased to discover their great mistakes and wandering from the first Patterns and Institutions of Christ Jesus.

I know the multitudes of Interpretations given upon Rev. 11. as touching the two Witnesses, and that many, if not most, incline to believe, at least to hope and desire, that their slaughter may be past and over: unto which in all humble submission to the holy counsels of God for Zion's sake, I most heartily say as Jeremy once said in another something like case, Amen. But all the Interpretations extant, that ever I have yet heard, or read of, they seem to me to lock up the Sun in a chamber, they are too narrow and particular, and

like some Almanacs, calculated for one Meridian and Climate. For Antichristianism is an Universal plague sore, spread over all the Empire that was Roman. The Roman Popes, as Vicars of Christ Jesus, pretend to a Roman Catholicism, or Universality also. The Lord Jesus, his cause, therefore, and the cause of his Saints, is of a more general and universal concernment, such hath the Witness of his Servants been in all ages, and Countries of Europe. Now notwithstanding many particular slaughters (as the Book of Martyrs and other catalogues of Christ's Witnesses testify) yet I see it not possible, that that Scripture can be satisfied but that after the Universal finishing of the Witnesses, there must follow an Universal persecution and slaughter unto which an Universal provocation and Exasperation by the Saints must probably precede and give Occasion.

Wherein hath the former, and latter Ministry been defective?

I answer, in all these four. Their Gifts, their Calling, their Work, their Wages.

First. In their Gifts: for notwithstanding they pretend to the Apostles' Commission, and to succeed them, Mat. 28, yet they have never pretended to the Gifts and Qualifications of such a Ministry, nor have they ever been able to clear up Two Foundations of the Christian Religion (Heb. 6) The Doctrine of Baptism, and the laying on of hands.

Secondly. Notwithstanding that some plead their Succession from the Apostles or Messengers, yet are they forced to run into the Tents of Antichrist, and to plead Succession from Rome, and neither such, nor others which plead their Calling from the People, can prove to my conscience from the Testimony of Christ Jesus, that either Christ's Succession did run in an Antichristian line, or that two or three godly persons might first make themselves a Church, and then make their Ministers, without a preceding Ministry from Christ Jesus unto them, and to guide them in such their Administrations.

Thirdly. The work of that Commission (Math. 28,) was exercised and administered to the Nations, as Nations, and the World. But all our professed Ministrations, former and latter, have been carried on (in a grand, and common mystery) for the converting of a converted people, for if we grant all Protestant Nations to be Christians, and so act with them in

prayer as Chistians, and the Children of God ; how can we pretend to convert the converted, and to preach unto them to convert them ? One or other must be denied, to wit, that they are converted, or if unconverted, that we may offer up Christian and Spiritual Sacrifices with them. No Herald, no Ambassador sent to a city or army of Rebels did ever (constantly least of all) perform such actions of State with those Rebels, which represents or renders them in a capacity of honest, and faithful subjects. Oh the patience and forbearance and long suffering of the Most High, whose eyes yet are as a flame of Fire.

Fourthly. In their Wages, whether by Tithes or otherwise, they have always run in the way of an hire, and rendered such Workmen absolute hirelings, between whom and the true Shepherd (John 10.) the Lord Jesus, puts so express and sharp a difference, so that in all humble submission, I am bold to maintain that it is one of the grand Designs of the Most High, to break down the Hireling Ministry, that Trade, Faculty, Calling and Living by Preaching, and that if all the Princes, States, Parliaments, and Armies, in the world, should join their Heads and Hearts, and Arms and Shoulders to support it, yet being a part of Babel and Confusion, it shall sink as a mill stone from the Angel's hand into the deeps forever.

But is not the Laborer worthy of his Reward ? I answer there is no Reward (by infinite degrees) comparable to an hundred fold (though with persecution) in this Life, and in the World to come Eternal life, to all that deny themselves in this Life and do teach and suffer for the name of the Son God.

Most strictly and particularly I answer First, He that makes a Trade of Preaching, that makes the care of Souls, and the charge of mens' eternal welfare, a Trade a Maintenance and Living, and explicitly makes a covenant or bargain (and therefore no longer penny, no longer a patermaster, no longer pay, no longer pray, no longer preach, no longer fast, &c.) I am humbly confident to maintain, that the Son of God, never sent such an one, to be a Laborer in his Vineyard : Such motions, spring not from the living and voluntary Spring of the Holy Spirit of God, but from the Artificial and worldly respects of Money, Maintenance, &c.

Wherein consists the making of the Hireling's, explicit, and implicit Bargain ?

I answer, 'Tis explicit, express, and plain, when there is a mutual declaring, and agreeing, for so much, or so much, in one kind or another, as the Levite agreed with Micha in the Judges.

Of this sort of explicit and plain Bargains by way of Tithes, Stipends, &c. How is our own and other Nations full and how many thousands are there of the instances of moving and removing from leaner to fatter Benefices, like the former Levite from the poor Chaplainships of Micha's family to the more rich and eminent Devotion of a Tribe of Dan, just like Servants hired by the year (more or less) stay not when they hear of proffers of more ease, and better Wages.

Secondly. An implicit or implied bargain or compact is when there passeth no express agreement for so much or so much, but having been brought up (as we say) to that only Trade, they must make their living of it, and therefore being something convinced of the Grosser way, they are content, as Watermen, Porters and the like with some kind of intimations by word of mouth, or in course, which shall amount to such a promise as this express: I know your Fare, your Due, I will content you &c. Trust to my Courtesy. The trial of this is plain, for without such an Implication or implied promise, the Hireling will not, indeed he cannot (having no other way to live on) move his Lip or Tongue, no more than a Waterman or Porter, his Hand or Foot.

Again. As to the Laborer worthy of his Reward, I answer, we find no other pattern in the Testament of Christ Jesus, but that both the Converting (or Apostolical Ministry) and the Feeding (or Pastoral) Ministry, did freely serve or minister and yet were freely supported by the Saints and Churches, and that not in stinted Wages, Tithes, Stipends, Salaries, &c. but with larger or lesser supplies, as the hand of the Lord was more or less extended in his weekly blessings on them.

Thirdly. When either through poverty or neglect, support and maintenance failed, yet still they eyed (Seaman and Soldiers say) the Good of the Voyage, and the Battle (the common cause of the Lord Jesus) and their own hands day and night, supplied their own and others' Necessities. And this was and will be the only way of the Laborer of the Son of God.

The Priests and Levites under the Law, had settled and constant maintenance.

I answer, Blessed be the father of Lights who hath shown his people of late times, the great difference between the stated and settled National Church, the Ministry and maintenance thereof, and the (ordinary) afflicted, moving, flying state of the Church, and Churches of Christ Jesus, all the world over.

Although it be granted, that the Hireling Ministry both explicit and implicit, is none of Christ's, yet this is wonderful what should be the reason why so much good hath been wrought thereby, as the conversion of thousands, &c.?

I answer, All the wisdom, mercy, goodness, and piety, that is in us, is but a drop to the ocean of that which is in the Father of mercies, who with infinite pity and patience, passeth by the ignorances and weaknesses of his children. Hence Luther, and other Monks, Cranmer, and other Bishops, Calvin, and other Presbyterians, God hath graciously covered their Failings, and accepted his own Grace of good desires, good Affections, and Endeavors, though many ways defiled by sin.

Thus was his infinite Goodness pleased to overlook the sin of Poligamy, or many Wives, in which so many of the Fathers or Patriarchs of Israel were brought foith.

Thus was he pleased to pass by the sins of the High Places, where Solomon himself offered Sacrifice. And yet as to this great point of good being done, we may with truth assert two things.

First, where God hath been pleased to bring in one soul to Himself by the Hireling Ministry, many more have been brought home by the voluntary and more single preachings of some, whether public or private, by the endeavors of private Christians, by the reading of the Holy Scriptures, by godly example, by afflictions, &c. Hence woful experience hath made it evident, that many excellent men (in their persons, and the graces of God's spirit) have labored a score of years, and more in an Hireling way, without the birth of one child to God; while others singly out of love to Christ Jesus, have despised bargains and hire, and been more abundantly blessed with merciful success and fruitfulness. Hence sure it is that there have been, are many excellent prophets and Witnesses of Christ Jesus, who never entered (as they say) into the Ministry, to wit, Lawyers, Physicians, Soldiers, Tradesmen, and others of higher, and lower rank, who by God's Holy

Spirit (breathing on their meditations on the Holy Scriptures, and other private helps) have attained, and much improved an excellent Spirit of knowledge, and utterance in the Holy Things of Jesus Christ, which spirit they ought to cherish, and further to improve to the praise of Christ.

Amongst so many Instances (dead and living) to the everlasting praise of Christ Jesus, and of his holy Spirit, breathing and blessing where he listeth, I cannot but with honorable Testimony remember that Eminent Christian Witness, and Prophet of Christ, even that despised, and yet beloved Samuel Howe, who being by calling a Cobler, and without human learning (which yet in its sphere and place he honored) who yet I say, by searching the Holy Scriptures grew so excellent a Textman, or Scripture learned man, that few of those high Rabbis, that scorn to mend or make a shoe, could aptly, and readily from the Holy Scriptures, outgo him: and however (through the oppressions upon some men's consciences even in Life and Death, and after Death in respect of burying, as yet unthought and unremedied) I say, however he was forced to seek a grave or bed in the very Highway, yet was his life and Death, and burial (being attended with many kindreds of God's people) honorable, and how much his rising again glorious.

But secondly, True and Right prophesying and Preaching, at first was, and shall be (because after God's own Way and Ordinance) beyond all compare with present Times; gloriously, and wonderfully Successful. Thus Acts 2 and 5, &c. poor Sinners came mourning after a Savior by thousands. The Church, and people of God since the Apostacy, is an Army routed, and can hardly preserve and secure itself, much less subdue, and conquer others, like a Vessel becalmed, at Sea, which though it make some way by Rowing and Towing, yet not comparable to what it doth when the mighty gales of God's Holy breath (as most he useth to do) in the ways of his own most holy appointments.

Thirdly, we may see a great mistake as touching that great point of Conversion: There is a great breathing in the souls of God's people, after the Conversion of the English, Irish, Jews, Indians, and blessed be God for those breathings, yet doubtless the first great work is the bringing of the Saints out of Babel, or confused Worships, and the downfall of Papacy, after the witnesses are slaughtered. Hence it is probably con-

ceived by some upon Rev. 15—that until the Vials be poured forth upon Antichrist, the smoke so filleth the Temple that no man, that is (few of the Jews or Gentiles) shall by conversion enter in.

Some will say, have there not been great and mighty conversions of whole Nations, England, Scotland, French, Dutch, &c., from Popery to good Protestantism ?

I answer. If the Holy Scriptures, the first pattern, and doleful experience may be judge, as an eminent person lately spake (upon occasion of a Debate touching the conversion of the Indians,) we have Indians at home, Indians in Cornwall, Indians in Wales, Indians in Ireland, yea as to the point of true Conversion, Regeneration by God's Spirit, who can deny but that the body of this and of all other Protestant Nations (as well as Popish) are unconverted, and (as formerly) ready to be converted and turned forward and backward as the Weather-Cock, according as the powerful wind of a prevailing Sword and Authority, shall blow from the various points and quarters of it.

By the merciful assistance of the Most High, I have desired to labor in Europe, in America, with English, with Barbarians, yea, and also I have longed after some trading with the Jews themselves, (for whose hard measure I fear the Nations, and England, have yet a score to pay.) But yet (as before) I cannot see but that the first and present great Design of the Lord Jesus, is to destroy the Papacy. In order to which, two great Works are to be effected.

First. His calling of his people, more and more out of the Babel of confused Worships, Ministries, &c. and the finishing of their Testimony against the Beast.

Secondly. The great sufferings, and slaughter of the Saints, upon occasion of which Christ Jesus in his holy wrath and jealousy, will burn and tear the bloody Whore of Rome, after which effected, the numberless number, Rev. 7—the fulness of the Gentiles or Nations (Rom. 9) together with the Jews, shall flow to Jesus Christ.

Thirdly. We may hence see our great mistake, both of ourselves and our Forefathers, as to the pretended Seed-plots and Seminaries for the Ministry, the Universities of Europe and the Universities of this Nation ; for although I heartily acknowledge that among all the outward Gifts of God, human learning, and the knowledge of languages, and good arts are

excellent, and excel other outward gifts, as far as light excels darkness; and therefore, that Schools of human learning ought to be maintained, in a due way, and cherished; yet notwithstanding, In Ordine ad ministerium, as to the Ministry of Christ Jesus, (any one of those Ministries, Eph. 4 8, Cor. 12) upon a due survey of their Institutions, and continual practices compared with the last will and Testament of Christ Jesus, they will be found to be none of Christ's, and that in many respects.

First. As to the name Scholar, although as to human learning, many ways lawful, yet as it is appropriated to such as practice the Ministry, have been at the Universities (as they say) it is a sacrilegious, and thievish title, robbing all believers and Saints, who are frequently in the Testament of Christ styled Disciples or Scholars of Christ, Jesus and only they as believers, and this Title is so much theirs that both man and woman believing, were called Scholars. Acts 9—There was a certain Disciple or Scholar, called Dorcas. Secondly, as to their Monkish and idle course of life partly so genteel and stately, partly so vain and superstitious, that to wet a finger in any pains or labor, it is a disgraceful and an unworthy Act: But the Church is built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, who were Laborers, Fishermen, Tent makers; Jesus Christ (although the Prince of Life) yet a poor carpenter, the chief corner stone. And I cannot but conceive, that, although it should not please the most holy and jealous God to stir up this renowned State, and their renowned Cromwell (the 2nd) to deal with our refined monasteries, as that blessed Cromwell the first did with the more gross and palpable superstitions in Henry the Eighth his days; yet in his time the Lord Jesus, whose is all power in Heaven and Earth, will spue out these Seminaries of Hirelings and mystical Merchants, out of his wrath, as he hath done with their Fathers, the superstitious and bloody Bishops before them.

Thirdly. As to their Popish, and vaunting Tithes, so strange from the New Testament, and language of Christ Jesus, or any word or title, that came forth of his blessed mouth (Bachelors of Divinity) (or Godliness) Doctor of Divinity, so clearly and expressly opposite to the command of the Lord Jesus Christ, call no man Father, Doctor, &c., that is by way of Eminency, in Spiritual, and heavenly regards, Rabbi, Rabbi, Doctor, Doctor, &c. I omit (because possibly for shame left



off in these days) their childsh ceremonies (used even by the most holy and conscientious) in their superstitious commencing and creatings &c. their holy Gowns, (black and red) holy cassocks, holy caps, holy scarfs, holy Rings, yea and holy boots also, &c. all is far from the purity, and simplicity of the Son of God, as far as the honest attire of some sober and chaste Matron, from the wanton, and flaunting vanities of some painted Harlot.

Fourthly. As to their (pretended) Spiritual and holy exercises proper only to the Churches and Assemblies of the Saints (the only Schools of the Prophets appointed by Christ Jesus.) How have they been by Courts imposed upon every nautical and unspiritual man who (in truth) perceives not the things that be of God: How have they been prostituted to every profane and unclean lip; unto whom saith God (Ps. 50) What hast thou to do to preach my word, and to take my name into thy mouth.

Fifthly. As to their being prepared, and fitted by these means as in a way of Apprenticeship, to set up the Trade and way of Preaching, the science, or faculty of Spiritual merchandise (Rev. 18, in a deep Mystery) of all sorts of spices and precious things, the precious sweet truths and promises of holy Scripture; yea (which we may with holy trembling add) a Trade of selling God himself, Christ Jesus, the Holy Spirit, Heaven, Hell, and (too, too often) their own Souls and the Souls of thousands.

But have there not come excellent men from thence, famous for Learning, Holiness, Labors, Success in the Souls of thousands, &c.?

I say, there have been excellent (some say Popes and Cardinals, and we are sure) Lord-Bishops and Monks, in their personal Holiness, Gifts, Learning, Labors, Success, and therein famous Prophets and Witnesses of Christ Jesus; yea, they have sealed the holy truths of God, which they have learned from the holy Scriptures, and which they have declared to others. I say they have sealed them with their heart blood, but that's no justification of their evil standing, Institutions, Administrations, &c. which (as by degrees it hath pleased the Father of Lights to discover unto them) they have come out of such Bondage, with shame and sorrow, and labored after the purity and simplicity of the Son of God.

But extraordinary gifts be ceased, how shall now the peo-

ple of the Nation, be supplied with Ministers, but from such Seminaries of Learning, to know, and Eloquence to utter the heavenly Mysteries ; or would you have the people be of no Religion at all, mere Atheists, without God, without his Word, without a Ministry, &c.? I answer, 'Tis true, those glorious first ministerial Gifts are ceased ; and that's or should be the lamentation of all Saints, to wit, the desolation, and the Widowhood of Zion: Yet I humbly conceive, that without those gifts, it is no ground of imitation, and of going forth to Teach, and Baptize the Nations ; for the Apostles themselves did not attempt that mighty enterprise, but waited at Jerusalem until the Holy Spirit descended on them, and enabled them for that mighty work ; least of all is that a ground of counterfeiting and suborning a lifeless picture of that first Ministry (like Jeroboam's Institution) when every one that hath Friends may be preferred to Fellowships in Colleges, to the superstitious Degrees and Titles of Divinity, (as they call it) and by these stairs ascend up the Gospel preferments, of rich and honorable Benefices. Yet

Secondly ; far be it from me to derogate from that honorable civility of training up of Youth in Languages, and other human learning, whether in the City of London, or other Towns, and Cities, &c. All that I bear witness against, is the counterfeiting and sacrilegious arrogating of the titles of God's Saints and Churches (as before) which are the only schools of the Prophets: As also, against sacrilegious and superstitious Degrees (as they call them) in the profession of Divinity, as if they only knew Divinity, Godliness, Holiness, and by such skill in godliness, and by such Degree, might succeed the ancient Scribes, and Pharisees, in the uppermost seats in Synagogues on Feasts, in Reverend titles and salutations, as the only Masters and Teachers of Religion and Godliness: and all this in way of the Hireling, dividing (Dan. 11) the whole Land for gain, so that there hath not been room (without some special and extraordinary privilege and license) for the poorest cottager to live in England, out of the Bishop's Diocese, and the Priest's Parish, and payments ; therefore

Thirdly ; In all humble reverence and due submission to the Higher Powers, I affirm there was never merely Civil State in the World (for that of the Jews, was mixed, and ceremonial) that ever did, or ever shall make good work of it, with a civil sword in spiritual matters, and therefore have but builded and plucked down, planted and plucked up, Churches, Ministries,

Disciplines, &c., I acknowledge with thankfulness that many heavenly spirits, in K. Edwards, Q Elizabeth's days, and since that, have been forming and reforming the states and nations, Religion, Worship, Ministry, &c. Doubtless intentions were holy (as David's), labors great, and God's mercy and pity and patience infinite: yet experience long and ever hath told us that there was never a Nation yet born in a day to God. That the bodies of all Nations are a part of the world, and although the Holy Spirit of God in every Nation where the Word comes, washeth white some Blackamores, and changeth some Leopard's spots, yet the bodies, and bulks of Nations, can not by all the acts and Statutes under heaven, put off the Blackamore skin, the Leopard spots, &c. O why then should the wisdom of so many ages still each after other, be preached (by the prevailing Hirelings of each time, again and again,) into the self-same delusion, of washing the Blackamores. There is not a Town nor a Parish, nor a person in England, but judge themselves christian, and to that end challenge the right, and use of a Minister, in Sacris, some, (as in all Religions in the World it is) to serve the Deity they worship, ex officio, as Sacerdotes, or holy persons, for and with them in prayers and holy Rites.

This mine eyes have often seen among the wild, yet wise, Americans, who yet (alas) as all the Nations of Europe, and the world, are utterly incapable of Forms and Ministers (or Officers) of Christian Worship, while yet in their natural, and worldly capacities nor born again, made spiritual and heavenly, by the holy Spirit of God. Yet,

Fourthly, I desire uprightly to be far from divers weights and measures in the things of God (especially): and therefore I desire not that liberty to myself, which I would not freely and impartially weigh out to all the consciences of the world beside: and therefore I do humbly conceive, that it is the will of the Most High and the express and absolute Duty of the civil powers to proclaim an absolute freedom in all the three Nations, yea, in all the world (were their powers so large) that each Town and Division of people, yea, and person, may freely enjoy what worships, what Ministry, what maintenance to afford them, their soul desireth. To this end I am humbly bold to offer, that it is not the will of the Father of Spirits, that all the consciences and Spirits of the Nation should violently [Vi et armis] be forced into one way of worship, or that any Town

or Parish [so called] in England, Scotland, or Ireland, be, disturbed in their worship [what worship soever it be] by the civil sword; if the people freely choose that way of worship, and ministry, and maintenance, they walk in—yea if they will freely pay them the Tenths, or Fifths, I shall not envy their Minister's maintenance, or disturb either Minister or peoples' conscience by any other sword, but with that spiritual sword of two edges, the sword of God's Spirit, the holy word of God.

Grant that bodies of the Nations to be but natural, but civil, and therefore, cannot without the changings of God's Spirit, be possibly fit as spiritual flocks of sheep, for spiritual Pastors, or shepherds, to feed and build them up with the spiritual Ordinance of Christ Jesus; yet, need they not a converting or begetting Ministry of Christ Jesus, to preach Repentance to them, to spiritualize and change them? and if so, where shall ten thousand Ministers be had to go to [about] that number of Parishes in England, without the constant supplies of the seed-plots and Seminaries, the Universities of the Nations?

I answer. First, there are great disputes among God's people whether Apostles or Messengers sent out to teach and baptize, that is, to convert the Nations, be yet an Ordinance of Christ Jesus continued, or being extraordinary ceased? There is a great dispute whether the Ministry of the twelve [Matth. 10] or of the 70 [Luke 10] be continued, since they both had an immediate call from Christ.

And Secondly, such excellent gifts, abilities and furniture from Christ, which now we find none are furnished with, as healing of the sick, raising of the dead, casting out Devils, &c. Further, whether all these gifts and administrations, Eph. 4 and 1 Cor 12, be to be expected?

For myself, I am sure of two things.

First, it is but little of the World yet that hath heard of the lost estate of mankind, and of a Savior, Christ Jesus; and as yet, the fulness of the Gentiles is not yet come, and probably shall not; until the downfall of the Papacy. Yet Secondly, the Ministry, or service of Prophets, and Witnesses, Mourning and Prophesying in Sackcloth, God hath immediately stirred up and continued all along the reign of the Beast, and Antichrist of Rome.

This Witness is probably near finished, and the bloody storm of the slaughter of the Witnesses, is yet to be expected

and prepared for: But this, and the time, and many passages of Rev. 11—is controversial and something like that of Christ's personal presence, the state of the New Jerusalem, the new Heaven and Earth, &c.

However, this is clear, that all that are entrusted with spiritual or temporal Talents, must lay them out for their Lord and Master, his advantage.

That all (of what rank soever) that have knowledge and utterance of heavenly Mysteries, and therein are the Lord's Prophets and Witnesses against Antichrist, must prophesy against false Christs, false Faith, false Love, false Joy, false Worship, and Ministrations, false Hope, and false Heaven, which poor souls in a golden dream, expect, and look for.

This Prophecy ought to be (chiefly) exercised among the Saints in the companies, meetings, assemblies of the fellow mourners and witnesses against the falsehoods of Antichrist: If any come in [as in 1 Cor 14] yea, if they come to catch, God will graciously more or less vouchsafe to catch them, if he intends to save them.

But for the going out to the Nations, Cities, Towns, as to the Nations, Cities and Towns of the World unconverted, until the downfall of the Papacy, Rev. 18.—and so the mounting of the Lord Jesus, and his white Troopers again, Rev. 19, &c. For the going out of any to preach upon hire, for the going out to convert sinners, and yet to hold Communion with them as Saints in prayer: For the going out without such a powerful call from Christ as the twelve, and the seventy had; or without such suitable gifts as the first Ministry was furnished with, and this especially without a due knowledge of the period of the Prophecies to be fulfilled, I have no Faith to act, nor in the Actings and Ministries of others; for

There is but one God, Lord, and Spirit, from whom those Gifts, Administrations and Operations proceed, 1 Cor. 12—without whose holy and heavenly concurrence in all these three, both Gifts, and Administrations, and Operations, instead of Glorifying the name of Christ, and saving Souls, we may Blaspheme his name, and grieve his spirit, and hinder and harden poor souls against Repentance, when we persuade them of their [already] blessed state of Christianity, and that they are New born, the saints and sons, and daughters of the living God; therefore,

Thirdly. If it shall please our most Noble Governors, to search into the Institution, and Constitution [as they have done of the Diocesan, so also] of the National and Parish Churches, [concerning which I shall humbly subjoin some queries in the close of all],

If they please to take off the Yokes, the Soul Yokes of binding all persons to such Parochial or Parish forms, permitting them to enjoy their belief whether within or without such parish worship, parish maintenance, parish Marryings, parish Buryings, by which the souls and consciences of so many have been imbondaged in life and death, and [their bodies, in respect of buryings] after death,

If they shall please so far [if not to countenance, yet] to permit impartially, all consciences, and especially the consciences, the meetings, and assemblies of faithful and conscionable people [the Volunteers in preaching Christ Jesus,] so as that what people and persons please may peaceably frequent and repair to such spiritual meetings and assemblies as they do the Parish Churches: I am humbly confident that, as to the point of converting souls to God, [so far as the present state of Christianity can be so promoted] the souls of thousands will bless God more than if millions of Hirelings were sent abroad from all the Universities both of Popish, and Protestant Countries.

Fourthly. Upon the grounds first laid, I observe the great and wonderful mistake, both of our own, and our Fathers, as to the civil powers of this world, acting in spiritual matters. I have read [as blessed Latimer once said] the last Will and Testament of the Lord Jesus, over many times, and yet I cannot find by one tittle of that Testament, that if he had been pleased to have accepted of a temporal Crown and Government, that ever he would have put the least finger of temporal or civil power, in the matters of his spiritual affairs and Kingdom. Hence must it lamentably be against the Testimony of Christ Jesus, for the Civil State to impose upon the Souls of the People a Religion, a Worship, a Ministry, Oaths, [in Religious and Civil affairs] Tithes, Times, Days, Marryings, and Buryings in holy ground yet in force, as I have [I hope] by the help of God, fully debated the great question with Master Cotton, and washed off all his late washings of that bloody Tenet of Pese-cution, &c.

What is then the express duty of the Civil Magistrate as to Christ Jesus, his Gospel and Kingdom?

I answer. I know how wofully that Scripture, Kings shall be thy nursing Fathers, &c., hath been abused, and elsewhere I have at large discussed that, and other such objections: At present, I humbly conceive, that the great Duty of the Magistrate, as to spirituals, will turn upon these two things.

First. In removing the Civil Bars, Obstructions, hindrances, in taking off those yokes, that pinch the very Souls and consciences of men, such as yet are the payments of of Tithes, and the Maintenance of Ministers, they have no faith in: Such are the enforced Oaths, and some ceremonies therein, in all the Courts of Justice, such are the holy Maryings, holy buryings, &c.

Secondly. In the free and absolute permission of the conscience of all men, in what is merely spiritual, not the very consciences of the Jews, nor the consciences of the Turks, or Papists, or Pagans themselves excepted.

But how will this propagate the Gospel of Christ Jesus? I answer thus, The first grand Design of Christ Jesus, is, to destroy, and consume his Mortal enemy, Antichrist. This must be done by the breath of his Mouth in his Prophets and Witnesses: Now the Nations of the World have impiously stopt this heavenly breath, stifled the Lord Jesus in his Servants. Now if it shall please the civil state to remove the state bars, set up to resist the holy spirit of God in his servants, [whom yet finally to resist, is not in all the powers of the world] I humbly conceive that the civil state hath made a fair progress in promoting the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

This Mercy and freedom is due to the [merely] religious consciences of men in the world. Is there no more due from the Magistrates to Christ Jesus, his Saints and Kingdom? I answer, while I plead the consciences of all men to be at Liberty, doubtless I must plead the Liberty of the Magistrate's conscience also, and therefore were his bounties and donations to his Bishops and Ministers as large as those of Constantine; who but the holy Spirit of God in the mouths of his Prophets can restrain him? Only let not Cæsar [as Constantine in his settled prosperity did] rob the God of heaven of his Rights, the consciences of his subjects, their heavenly Rights, and Liberties.

But under the pretence of propagating the Gospel of Christ Jesus [it may be said] what horrible opinions and spirits will be vented, as woful experience hath manifested?

I answer. Opinions offensive are of two sorts; some favoring of Impiety, and some Incivility.

Against the first, Jesus Christ never called for the Sword of Steel to help the Sword of the Spirit, that two edged Sword that comes out of the mouth of the Lord Jesus: And therefore, if a World of Arians deny the Deity of Christ Jesus: If a Maniche deny his human nature; If the Jews deny both, and blasphemously call our Christ a Deceiver: Nay, if the Mahometans, the Turks [the greater part by far of one Religion in the world] if they I say, prefer their cheating Mahomet before him, what now? Must rail, revile, &c. and cry out Blasphemer, Heretic? Must we run to the Cutler's shop, the Armories and Magazines of the cities and Nations? Must we run to the Cities and Nations, and Senates, and cry, Help ye men of Ephesus, help, O Inhabitants of Jerusalem, &c.? Or must we fly up to Heaven by prayers and curses, to fetch down Fire upon the persecuting Captains and their fifties? This do the Nations, this do false Christs and Christians; but this did not, This will not do the Lamb of God, the Lion of Judah's Tribe, who with his Word and Spirit alone [which the Father hath promised to put into his Mouth, and the Mouth of his Seed, and the Mouth of his Seed's Seed, [Isa. 59] will either kill or save the gainsaying Opposite. The second sort, to wit opinions of Incivility, doubtless the opinions, as well as the practices, are the proper Object of the Civil Sword; according to that and Magna Charta, for the civil Magistrate, Rom. 13—and that true Apothegm or saying, *Ex malis moribus bonae leges*: Good Laws occasioned by evil manners.

But ought not the civil Magistrates to repeal their Ordinance for Tithes, and also to appoint some course for the maintenance of the Ministry?

I answer. Upon the Ground of removing Soul Yokes and not restraining, nor constraining conscience, I humbly conceive that the civil State cannot by any Rule from Christ Jesus, either forbid the payment of Tithes to such whose conscience is to pay them, or enjoin them where the conscience is not so persuaded: For the further clearing of which assertion, I distinguish the people of this Nation, into two sorts, First, Such as have a Freedom in their mind to frequent the Public, Parish Assemblies of the Nation; and they are also of two sorts.



First. Such conscientious zeal of worshipping God, or out of a superstitious and traditional awe.

Secondly. Such as can go or not go, and care not what Religion themselves and the State be of.

There is a second sort of people in this Nation, which out of conscience dare not frequent such places ; and they are such.

First. Such as indeed Fear God, and are in their consciences persuaded of an indelible Character of Holiness upon such Temples, as Temples dedicated to a Parish worship.

Secondly. Such as out of an utter dislike of all Protestant Worship, and an high esteem of their own Catholic Faith, are as far from love to such places, as the former sort.

Now all these consciences [yea the very conscience of the Papists, Jews, &c. [as I have proved at large in my answer to Master Cotton's Washings] ought freely and impartially to be permitted their several respective Worships, their Ministers of worship and what way of maintaining them they freely choose.

But if the civil state enjoin not the maintenance of the Ministry : If they quite let loose of the Golden Reins of Discipline [as the Parliament exprest and the Scots objected] What will become of the Ministry of the Gospel, and the Souls of men ? For if each man's conscience be at Liberty to come to Church or not, to pay to the Minister or not, the profane and loose will neither pay, nor pray, but turn Antichrist, and irreligious. The Ministers of Worship will be discouraged and destitute, and Parents will have little mind to expend their monies to make their children Scholars, when the Hope of their preferment is cut off.

I answer. First, that the Supreme Court in their Declaration never Declared to bar up all the Doors and Windows of that Honorable House, so that no further counsels come from the most glorious Sun of Righteousness the Lord Jesus.

Although the loose will be more loose [yet] possibly being at more Liberty, they may be put upon consideration, and choice of ways of life and peace ; yet however it is infinitely better that the profane and loose be unmasked, than to be muffled up under the veil and hood of Traditional Hypocrisy, which turns and dulls the very edge of all conscience either towards God or man.

Thirdly. It is not to be doubted, but that each conscience, the Papists, and the Protestants, both Presbyterians, and Independents, will emulously strive for [their not only conscience

but] credit's sake, to excel and win the Garland in the fruits of bounty, &c. Thus a Jesuit once in New Gate boasted of the Papist charity to a Protestant [put in also for his conscience by the Bishops]; for, pulling out his handful of Gold, look here [said he] are the fruits of our Religion.

Fourthly. Such Parents, or children, as aim at the gain and preferment of Religion, do often mistake Gain and Gold, for Godliness; God-belly for the true God, and some false, for the true Lord Jesus. I add, such Priests or Ministers as can force a maintenance of Tithes or otherwise, by the Sword, or can else cease preaching for want of such or such maintenance, or can remove from Bishoprics or Benefices [as Calves and Bulls of Bashan] for fatter, and ranker pastures: or wanting Spiritual work and maintenance, are too fine to work with their hands, as the first patterns, Christ's first Ministers did; how can they say as Peter, to Christ Jesus, Lord thou knowest all things, thou knowest that I love thee, &c.

Therefore, lastly, The Father of Spirits graciously be pleased to preserve the spirits of our higher powers from laying on of Hay and Stubble, though upon the Golden foundation, Christ Jesus; for all such work in matters spiritual, which our Forefathers either Popish or Protestant, in their several changes in this Nation have made, they have been consumed, and burnt (like Hay and Stubble) and come to nothing.

The Summa Totalis of all the former particulars is this. First, since the people of this Nation have been forced into a National way of Worship, both Popish and Protestant (as the wheels of time's revolutions, by God's mighty providence and permission have turned about) The civil state is bound before God to take off that bond and yoke of Soul oppression, and to proclaim free and impartial Liberty to all people of the three Nations, to choose and maintain what Worship and Ministry their Souls and consciences are persuaded of: which Act, as it will prove an Act of mercy and Righteousness to the enslaved Nations, so is it of a binding force to engage the whole and every Interest, and conscience to preserve the common peace: However, an Act most suiting with the piety and Christianity of the holy Testament of Christ Jesus.

Secondly. The civil state is humbly to be implored, to provide in their high Wisdom for the security of all the re-

spective consciences in their respective meetings, assemblings, worshipings, &c. and that civil peace and the beauty of civility, and humanity be maintained among the chief opposers and dissenters.

Thirdly, It is the duty of all that are in Authority, and of all that are able, to countenance, encourage and supply such true Volunteers, as give and devote themselves to the service and Ministry of Christ Jesus in any kind: although it be also the duty and will be the practice of such, whom the Spirit of God sends upon any work of Christ's, rather to work as Paul did, among the Corinthians, and Thessalonians, than the work and service of their Lord and Master should be neglected.

Such true Christian Worthies (whether endowed with human Learning, or without it) will alone be found that despised model which the God of Heaven will only bless; that poor handful, and three hundred out of Israel's thirty-two thousand, by whom the work of the God of Israel must be effected. And if this course be effected, in the three Nations, the bodies and Souls of the three Nations will be more and more at peace and in a fairer way than ever to that peace which is Eternal, when the World is gone.

## NOTE.

☞ What does the reader now think of a "Hireling Ministry?"—what of their pretensions to piety, who will not preach the Gospel, unless they can get a living by it?—what of the sincerity of such persons as glory in the Antichristian "*titles*" scrambled for by so many nominal ministers of Christ, Baptists as well as others?—what of the "seed-plots" for furnishing the world with manufactured ministers, which the *people* are made to suppose are a modern improvement not heard of before the nineteenth century?—what of removals to "fatter Benefices," whose larger "salaries" are considered as louder "*calls*" from God?—what of Mr. Williams' views of calls to the ministry?—what of Roger Williams' political character and "intermeddlings"?—what of his opinion of the right of civil government to establish *slavery*, which excludes every slave from all freedom of conscience, even to read the Bible or to join any Church without express permission from his "*owner*," or to profess any faith which his "*master*" forbids him to profess, or to have his own wife, or *her* own husband, or to preach the Gospel, only by special permission of a master, it may be the most ungodly wretch in the land, or to be "buried" in the *day time* or among the white members of *the Church*? What think you of the Northern man who *speaks* eulogiums on the character of ROGER WILLIAMS, but treats with contempt the sentiments whose advocacy has made his name worthy of remembrance, and despises those brethren who are now humbly endeavoring to make those sentiments practical realities in the American Churches.

"PROVE ALL THINGS; HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."

# INDEX.

|                                                                                                                                           | PAGE.     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Occasion of the Review,.....                                                                                                              | 3         |
| Mr. Fuller's views of slavery and his argument,.....                                                                                      | 5-35, &c. |
| Mr. F. not a eulogist of slavery, yet he regards it not a moral evil,                                                                     | 6, 22     |
| Consequences of abolition not to be regarded, if slavery be a sin,                                                                        | 7, 99     |
| His view of Mr. W.'s admission that the Bible sanctions slavery,                                                                          | 8         |
| The "Correspondence" counteracts much labor already done,.                                                                                | 9         |
| Mr. F.'s argument sophistical, and truth may triumph,.....                                                                                | 10        |
| His definition of slavery and Paley's,.....                                                                                               | 30        |
| Mr. W.'s addition to the definition—Mr. F. defends slavery as<br>it is,.....                                                              | 11        |
| God instituted slavery, Mr. F.'s premise—Slavery like parental<br>and civil government.....                                               | 13        |
| Slave's rights secured—New view to Mr. W. and better,.....                                                                                |           |
| Mr. F. not impeccable,.....                                                                                                               | 16        |
| Can't associate with abolitionists—No one can, &c,—It is time<br>the question were settled,.....                                          | 18<br>19  |
| Natural religion condemns slavery,.....                                                                                                   | 22        |
| No free people ought to be reduced to a state of slavery—Irres-<br>ponsible power not safe—Inferences from Mr. F.'s state-<br>ments,..... | 23        |
| Man may not test the truth of the Bible by what it contains,...                                                                           | 24, 67    |
| God gave every man liberty—The word "right" is out of place<br>in Mr. F.'s definition,.....                                               | 26        |
| The United States Constitution,.....                                                                                                      | 27        |
| God denounces slavery,.....                                                                                                               | 29        |
| Suppose white Americans in slavery,.....                                                                                                  | 31        |
| Abuses of slavery condemned, but the relation right.. Miss<br>Martineau,.....                                                             | 32        |
| No man can consent to be a slave,.....                                                                                                    | 33        |
| Mr. F. too much for Mr. W.,.....                                                                                                          | 34        |
| Prayer for Mr. F.,.....                                                                                                                   | 35        |
| Hebrew Philology—Greek of New Testament,.....                                                                                             | 47        |
| Noah's curse,.....                                                                                                                        | 43        |
| Joseph a slave,.....                                                                                                                      | 44        |
| The word slave not in the Bible—Revelation xviii,.....                                                                                    | 45        |
| Abraham had servants, but no slaves,.....                                                                                                 | 50        |
| Isaac, Jacob and the twelve patriarchs,.....                                                                                              | 56        |
| Sold themselves,.....                                                                                                                     | 57        |
| Circumcision a rite making all its subjects citizens. Servants,<br>&c',.....                                                              | 58        |
| Patriarchal government—Yahn or Jahn,.....                                                                                                 | 59        |
| "Absolute liberty too violent a stimulant"—They "may enslave<br>us"—Mr. W.—This his triumph?.....                                         | 61        |

|                                                                                                   | PAGE:      |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| The Mosaic Law, .....                                                                             | 62         |
| Abimelech, &c., .....                                                                             | 63         |
| Buying servants a different thing from buying and selling men..                                   |            |
| Buy..possession—for ever, .....                                                                   | 64, 69, 81 |
| Parental authority supreme over the child and, therefore, the<br>slaveholder can have none, ..... | 65, 109    |
| Logic a convenient thing, .....                                                                   | 65         |
| Heathenism might tolerate slavery, but Jehovah never, .....                                       | 67         |
| Ignorance not Mr. F.'s protection, .....                                                          | 72         |
| Philology challenged, .....                                                                       | 73         |
| Hired servants and strangers not freemen till circumcised, .....                                  | 77         |
| " For ever." .....                                                                                | 70         |
| " Possession," .....                                                                              | 77         |
| The baptized free, .....                                                                          | 77         |
| Political bearings of the subject, .....                                                          | 78         |
| Slaves admitted to be men and Christian Brethren, .....                                           | 79         |
| Protection of servants under the Mosaic law, .....                                                | 80         |
| Marriage not annulled by the Mosaic law, .....                                                    | 82         |
| The purchase money paid to the person bought, .....                                               | 81         |
| Hebrews were sold, .....                                                                          | 81         |
| Divorcement bill of..Ear bored, .....                                                             | 85         |
| Josephus' explanation of the words " for ever," .....                                             | 85         |
| Jubilee, all free, .....                                                                          | 85         |
| Judas sold Jesus, .....                                                                           | 86         |
| Gibeonites tributaries, .....                                                                     | 87         |
| Governments hold not the right to condemn those who obey the<br>law of God, .....                 | 87         |
| C. T. Torrey legally imprisoned, .....                                                            | 88         |
| Abolitionists in conflict with the Bible, .....                                                   | 88         |
| Good men responsible for the acts of their party, .....                                           | 89, 103    |
| Gov. Hammond, .....                                                                               | 90         |
| A Floridian patriarch, .....                                                                      | 90         |
| " Terror" the universal influence employed on slaves and all col-<br>ored people, .....           | 91         |
| Freedom the only thing valuable to be offered a slave, .....                                      | 92         |
| Connubial concerns not to be interfered with, .....                                               | 93         |
| Religion spoils the slaves, .....                                                                 | 93         |
| Repeal of slave laws by universal practice, .....                                                 | 94         |
| Breckenridge's view, .....                                                                        | 95         |
| Cassius M. Clay, .....                                                                            | 96         |
| Education of a colored man as important as that of others.. Why<br>not ? .....                    | 97         |
| North and South compared, .....                                                                   | 97         |
| Mr. Fuller's slaves educated ? .....                                                              | 98         |
| Mr. Fuller to Agricultural Society, .....                                                         | 99         |
| Expediency taught by the Lord Jesus Christ, .....                                                 | 99         |
| Paul a craven and faithless herald, if, .....                                                     | 100        |
| The boldness of Mr. F., .....                                                                     | 101, 113   |
| Human enactments do not affect slavery, .....                                                     | 104        |
| Despotism..Slavery unrestrained by law, .....                                                     | 104        |
| Expansion of the golden rule, .....                                                               | 104        |
| George Keely, .....                                                                               | 106        |
| Sleep may be slavery, .....                                                                       | 107        |
| Voluntary slave, .....                                                                            | 107        |

|                                                                                                   | PAGE.    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| The thing .not the name to be regarded, .....                                                     | 108      |
| Condemned by Bible,....                                                                           | 108      |
| Fallacy of Mr. F.'s argument,.....                                                                | 9, 108   |
| Anti-Republican,.....                                                                             | 111      |
| Thomas Jefferson, .....                                                                           | 111      |
| John Baptist,.....                                                                                | 113      |
| Daniel, .....                                                                                     | 113      |
| " Powers that be,".....                                                                           | 113      |
| Pride of piety,.....                                                                              | 114      |
| Roger Williams,.....                                                                              | 115      |
| 1740—Law against teaching slaves, .....                                                           | 115      |
| Ministers yield to certain considerations, .....                                                  | 115      |
| White people oppressed,.....                                                                      | 116      |
| Tyrants degrade their subjects,.....                                                              | 117      |
| 1830.. Modern Abolitionism,.....                                                                  | 117      |
| Wesley and Whitfield, .....                                                                       | 117      |
| White slaves, Greeks &c.,.....                                                                    | 121      |
| Who shall be the slave? .....                                                                     | 121      |
| Prohibition of slavery by the Gospel. Matth. xx.,.....                                            | 122      |
| Despotism expressly forbidden by Christ,.....                                                     | 122      |
| Violence essential to slavery,.....                                                               | 124      |
| Mr. Wayland's conduct of the argument,.....                                                       | 124      |
| Independent inquiry every man's duty, .....                                                       | 125      |
| Euclid not to be believed, but demonstrated,.....                                                 | 125      |
| Error perpetuated by the corresspondence,.....                                                    | 126      |
| Prohibitory precept,.....                                                                         | 122, 145 |
| Perspicuity of Christ and mystery of the " Doctors," .....                                        | 145      |
| The necessity of the prohibitory precept,.....                                                    | 146      |
| Roman Tyranny, .....                                                                              | 147      |
| Tyrants call each other benefactors or righteous people.....                                      | 148      |
| Christ condemned the wickedness of the government under which<br>he lived, .....                  | 148      |
| Superlative meanness and turpitude of robbing the poor,.....                                      | 149      |
| The superior " moral science,".....                                                               | 150      |
| Gospel ultraism.. Degrees in guilt.. Slavery the most flagrant of<br>the sins of oppression,..... | 151      |
| The Christian required to be a doulos, or voluntary servant..<br>Christ's example, .....          | 152      |
| Pride and slaveholding rebuked by the example of Christ,.....                                     | 153      |
| Sermon by Roger Williams,.....                                                                    | 155—183  |
| Note by the Editor,.....                                                                          | 184      |

W46









WERT  
BOOKBINDING  
Grantville, Pa  
Jan - Feb 1989  
WERT Quality Bound

